G3130-1

RECRUITING TRENDS 1985-86

A Study of 710 Businesses, Industries, Governmental Agencies, and Educational Institutions Employing New College Graduates

by

John D. Shingleton
Director of Placement

and

L. Patrick Scheetz, Ph.D.
Assistant Director of Placement

Michigan State University
Placement Services
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

ACKOWLEDGEMENTS

Placement Services at Michigan State University appreciates the time and effort expended by employers who so graciously responded to the Recruiting Trends survey for 1985-86. We recognize that collecting and recording data for this research poses a burden on already heavy schedules. We extend a special thanks to those employers who completed and returned our questionnaire so promptly. Because of your extra efforts, we can continue to provide this information on trends in hiring of new college graduates by organizations in business, industry, government and education.

For assisting us with development of new questions for this year's survey and for identifying new job market trends, we wish to thank Mr. Ed Fitzpatrick, Mr. Tony Rogalski, Ms. Rebecca Jost, Ms. Vernicka Biles, Dr. Jim Bowling, Ms. Carolyn Diamond, Ms. Pat Anderson, and Mr. Bob Watts of our staff at Placement Services. Ms. Karen Nelson, also an assistant director of Placement Services, helped with these tasks and, in addition, advised us on editing of the final report.

Moreover, this report could not have been completed without the fine efforts of our excellent clerical staff. Jennifer Leedy, Ruth Lee, Cindi Bauers, Rebecca Smyth, Anne Marie Engel, and Andrew Chiplock assisted us with the collection of necessary data and preparation of the final report.

To all who participated in compilation of this report, we say thank you.

John D. Shingleton

Dr. L. Patrick Scheetz

Copyright: December 2, 1985
Michigan State University

Price: $25.00

CONTENTS

	Summary	Pages
Job Outlook	iv	14
Demand for Academic Majors	iv	15
Hiring Trends	v	17
Hiring Quotas	v	10-11
Employers Responding to the Survey	vi	1-3
Changes in Salaried Employees	vi	4-5
Acceptance of Job Offers	vii	12-13
Interviewing Schedules	vii	19-20 & 22
Salary Offers	viii	23-24 & 26
Calculating Starting Salary Offers	ix	29
Resumes	x	29
Job Availability	x	30
Sources of Graduates	x	31
Grade Point Averages	x	33-34
Job Succes Predictors	xi	34-35
Screening Methods	xi	36
Reference Checks	xi	37
Today's College Student	xii	38-39
Prescreening	xii	40
Closed Schedules	xii	41
Hiring Efficiency	xii	42
Interviewing Without Job Prospects	xiii	43
Colleges Selected For Recruiting	xiii	43
Contracts	xiii	44
Time Allowed for Acceptance of Job Offers	xiv	46
Handicappers	xiv	47
Reasons for Choosing Job Offers	xiv	48
Tuition Payments	xiv	49-50
Reneging	xv	51-52
Problems of New Hires	xv	52-53
Effective College Relations	xvi	54
Description of a Good Campus Interviewer	xvi	56
Cooperative Education and Summer Employment	xvii	57-58
Turnover Among New Hires	xvii	59
Effective College Placement Services	xvii	60-61
Employers Surveyed		65-72

Summary of
RECRUITING TRENDS 1985-86
A Study of 710 Businesses, Industries, Governmental Agencies, and Educational Institutions Employing New College Graduates

This is a summary of the 15th annual Recruiting Trends survey completed by Placement Services at Michigan State University. For this 1985-86 survey, a cross-section of employers from business, industry, government, and education were contacted; and responses were received from 710 organizations. The results of this survey include information regarding anticipated changes in hiring trends for new college graduates, expected starting salaries, campus recruiting activities, new recruitment techniques, and many other topics of interest to personnel directors, placement officers, career counselors, faculty, and students.

JOB OUTLOOK FOR GRADUATES OF 1985-86

During 1985-86, surveyed employers expect to hire about 1.4% more bachelor's degree graduates than they hired during 1984-85. Since last year was a good year for placement of new college graduates, the Class of 1986 can expect to have similar job opportunities. (Page 14)

For minorities, quotas are expected to increase 6.4%, and for women graduates, 4.7%. MBA and master's graduates can expect almost no increases in quotas (+0.1%), and doctoral candidates can expect a decrease of 1.0%.

Demand for Various Academic Majors

Supporting the expectation that demand for new bachelor's degree graduates will only increase slightly this year is the report that demand for almost every academic major will show minimal gains. (Pages 15-16)

These include: electrical engineering (3.9%); computer science (3.8%); mechanical engineering (3.4%); industrial engineering (3.0%); accounting (2.7%); marketing/sales (2.7%); education (1.9%); hotel, restaurant, and institutional management (1.8%); chemical engineering (1.8%); general business administration (1.5%); metallurgy and materials science (1.5%); chemistry (1.4%); and civil engineering (1.3%).

Very slight increases in demand are expected for: personnel administration (0.9); retailing (0.8%); liberal arts/arts and letters (0.6%); physics (0.6%); social sciences (0.6%); financial administration (0.5%); mathematics (0.5%); telecommunication (0.4%); human ecology/home economics (0.4%); natural resources (0.3%); advertising (0.3%); communications (0.2%); journalism (0.2%); and geology (0.1%).

No change in the job market is expected for agriculture (0.0%).

From these data, it should be evident again that a slight overall increase in the job market is expected during 1985-86.

Hiring Trends by Employer Category

Varying hiring trends are expected this year among different types of organizations. According to employers responding to this survey, the greatest increases are expected for bachelor's degree graduates in food, beverage processing, and restaurants (19.0%); accounting (18.6%); construction and building materials manufacturers (11.5%); and service and volunteer organizations (10.8%). (Pages 17-18)

Those organizations expecting moderate increases in the job market will include merchandising and retail services (5.1%); educational institutions (4.6%); automotive and mechanical equipment (4.5%); agribusiness (4.2%); governmental administration (3.2%); electronics and instruments (2.8%); hospitals and health services (1.6%); printing, publishing and information services (1.4%); hotels, motels, resorts and recreation services (1.3%); diversified conglomerates (1.2%); and tire and rubber products (1.0%).

Communication, radio, TV, and newspapers (0.0%); and chemicals, drugs, and allied products (0.2%) are expected to remain about the same or increase very slightly.

Those organizations with declining job markets include electrical machinery and equipment-computers (-0.3%); banking, finance and insurance (-0.7%); military services (-1.0%); public utilities including transportation (-1.0%); metals and metal products (-4.2%); research and consulting services (-5.8%); glass, paper, packaging, and allied products (-13.0%); and petroleum and allied products (-17.0%).

Hiring Quotas

The total hiring quota for new college graduates this year (1985-86) among 619 reporting organizations expecting to hire is 67,347. This is an increase of 2.0% over the actual hires of 66,012 reported by these organizations for last year (1984-85). (Pages 10-11)

No new college graduates were hired during 1984-85 by 69 of 710 organizations responding to this year's survey. This year (1985-86), 72 of those same organizations expect to hire no new college graduates. This compares to 80 of 658 organizations who hired none in 1983-84.

Employers Responding to This Survey

Employers of all sizes and all types were included in this survey. Responses for the 1985-86 Recruiting Trends survey were received from 710 employers respresenting businesses, industries, governmental agencies, and educational institutions throughout the United States. Of the respondents, 78.5% were businesses and industries, 16.3% educational institutions, and 5.2% governmental agencies and military services. (Pages 1-3)

Organizations with 10,000 or more employees were respresented by 11.3% of the respondents, those with five to ten thousand employees were 8.6% of the respondents, and organizations with a thousand to five thousand employees represented 28.9% of the respondents.

Organizations with five hundred to a thousand employees were represented by 15.5% of the respondents, those with 100 to 499 employees by 24.5% of the respondents, and those with one to ninety-nine employees were represented by 11.3% of the respondents.

Changes in Salaried Employees Last Year

Since changes in numbers of salaried employees working for surveyed employers can be a good indication of hiring intentions, employers were questioned regarding salaried employees working for their organizations last year. (Pages 4-6)

Surveyed employers reported a net increase of 1.7% in numbers of salaried employees last year. This compares to an increase of 1.5% in 1983-84 and a decrease of 1.4% during 1982-83. During the last two year, surveyed employers have increased the numbers of salaried employees working for their organizations by very slight amounts, after appreciably cutting their salaried payrolls during 1982-83.

Organizations with significant increases in salaried employees last year included accounting (9.3%); food, beverage processing, and restaurants (6.4%); aerospace and components (4.7%); hospitals and health services (4.5%); printing, publishing, and informational services (4.3%); construction and building materials manufacturers (3.2%); electronics and instruments (3.3%); research and consulting services (3.1%); merchandising and retail services (2.9%); service and volunteer organizations (2.5%); governmental administration (2.3%) metals and metal products (2.2%); and military services (2.0%).

Moderate increases were experienced by the following organizations: chemicals, drugs, and allied products (1.9%); educational institutions (1.6%); banking, finance, and insurance (1.2%); hotels, motels, resorts and recreation services (0.9%); and petroleum and allied products (0.1%).

Decreases in salaried employees occurred in electrical machinery and equipment (-5.9%); glass, paper, packaging, and allied products (-5.0%); tire and rubber products (-4.0%); diversified conglomerates (-3.1%); automotive and mechanical equipment (-1.6%); agribusiness (-1.2%); and public utiltities including transportation (-0.9%).

Anticipated Changes in Salaried Employees in 1985-86

During 1985-86, a moderate increase of 2.8% is expected in numbers of salaried employees working for surveyed employers. This compares to an expected increase of 3.5% last year (1984-85). These data suggest that a very cautious growth can be expected in numbers of salaried employees during 1985-86. (Pages 7-9)

Anticipating the greatest increases in salaried employees are hotels, motels, resorts and recreation facilities (11.4%); food, beverage processing, and restaurants (10.3%); communication-radio, TV, and newspapers (10.0%). These are followed closely by accounting (9.0%); service and volunteer organizations (8.5%); hospitals and health services (5.8%); merchandising and retail services (5.1%); banking, finance, and insurance (4.6%); electronics and instruments (4.4%); aerospace and components (4.3%); tire and rubber products (4.0%); research and consulting services (3.7%); construction and building materials manufacturing (3.4%); and military services (3.0%).

Moderate increases in salaried employees are anticipated in chemicals, drugs, and allied products (2.0%); educational institutions (1.7%); metals and metal products (1.5%); printing, publishing, and information services (1.4%); governmental administration (1.2%); and agribusiness (0.6%).

Those expecting no increases or even declines in salaried employees are public utilities including transportation (-0.1%); glass, paper, packaging, and allied products (-0.9%); diversified conglomerates (-1.6%); automotive and mechanical equipment (-1.9%); petroleum and allied products (-2.2%); and electrical machinery and equipment-computers (-4.3%).

Percentage of Graduates Accepting Job Offers

Although numbers of new college graduates hired by surveyed employers are an excellent measure of past job market trends, percent of job offers accepted are another. Of the new technical college graduates recruited during 1984-85 by surveyed employers, 59.7% accepted offers of employment. This compares to an acceptance rate of 59.0% in 1983-84 and 60.1% in 1982-83. If this change in rate is significant at all, it indicates a slight improvement in the recruitment techniques of employers, because a slightly higher percentage of technical graduates interviewed on campuses are accepting job offers or fewer job offers are being received by each student, so they have fewer choices. (Page 12)

Offers of employment to non-technical college graduates were accepted at the rate of 68.2% during 1984-85. This compares to an acceptance rate of 68.5% in 1983-84 and 65.3% in 1982-83. While a very slight increase in the acceptance rate was noted between 1982-83 and 1983-84, perhaps suggesting a slight erosion in the job market for non-technical graduates, no significant change was reported between the 1983-84 and 1984-85 job markets for non-technical graduates. (Page 13)

Changes in Numbers of Interviewing Schedules

According to employers responding to this survey, a very slight increase in numbers of interview schedules is expected on college campuses (+2.6%) this year; and approximately 2.8% more campuses will be visited by these employers. With hiring quotas increasing by 1.4% and campus interviewing increasing 2.6%, it is evident that employers are continuing their program of selectivity when recruiting on college campuses this year. (Pages 19-22)

The greatest increases in interview schedules can be expected from the following organizations: service and volunteer organizations (+31.3%); food, beverage processing, and restaurants (+18.9%); construction and building materials manufacturers (+13.0%); and educational institutions (+12.8%).

Moderate increases can be expected from accounting (+8.8%); research and consulting services (+7.6%); hotels, motels, resorts and recreation facilities (+6.5%); governmental administration (+5.6%); agribusiness (+3.8%); printing, publishing, and information services (+3.3%); electronics and instruments (+2.9%); aerospace and components (+2.5%); hospitals and health services (+2.4%); merchandising and retail services (+2.2%); communication--radio, TV, and newspapers (+2.0%); and banking finance, and insurance (+0.6%).

No change in numbers of campus interview schedules is expected for military organizations (0.0%).

Those organizations expecting declines in interview schedules will include the following: public utilities including transportation (-0.8%); tire and rubber products (-2.0%); metals and metal products (-2.9%); automotive and mechanical equipment (-7.7%); chemicals, drugs, and allied products (-6.5%); glass, paper, packaging, and allied products (-11.0%); diversified conglomerates (-15.0%); electrical machinery and equipment (-16.0%); and petroleum and allied products (-31.0%).

Of those organizations surveyed this year, 72 do not expect to interview on any college campuses.

Starting Salary Offers

Starting salary offers will increase by an average of 1.8% for bachelor's degree graduates, according to employers responding to this survey. For women and minorities, average increases of 3.1% and 3.2%, respectively, are expected. At the MBA/master's level, increases of 2.7% are anticipated, and for doctoral degree graduates, 2.2%. (Page 23)

None of these starting salary increases are expected to equal last year's increases of 3.7% for bachelor's graduates, 3.3% for MBA/master's graduates, and 2.9% for doctoral degree recipients.

Highest among anticipated salary increases for graduates this year are computer science majors (2.6%), electrical engineers (2.5%), mechanical engineers (2.3%), accounting (2.1%), marketing/sales (2.1%), education (2.0%), chemical engineers (2.0%), and industrial engineers(2.0%). (Pages 26-27)

Those majors with anticipated increases in the moderate range are: general business administration (1.9%); mathematics (1.9%); financial administration (1.8%); civil engineering (1.8%); liberal arts/arts and letters (1.8%); chemistry (1.8%); physics (1.8%); personnel administration (1.6%); metallurgy and materials science (1.6%); retailing (1.6%); social sciences (1.6%); geology (1.5%); hotel, restaurant, and institutional management (1.4%); communications (1.4%); journalism (1.4%); human ecology/home economics (1.4%); and advertising (1.3%).

Starting salaries for agriculture (0.8%) and natural resources (0.7%) majors are expected to increase less than 1.0%.

Again this year, the highest starting salaries are expected for electrical engineers ($29,187), mechanical engineers ($28,971), chemical engineers ($28,739), and computer science majors ($27,775). Other top starting salaries include industrial engineers ($26,817), civil engineers ($24,761), and physics majors ($24,370). (Page 28)

Next on the list of starting salaries are financial administration majors ($20,803), accountants ($20,338), chemistry ($19,679), general business administration ($19,589), marketing/sales ($19,284), and mathematics ($19,014). These are followed by social science majors ($18,324), communications ($17,923), agriculture ($17,841), advertising ($17,832), personnel administration ($17,727), telecommunications ($17,473), liberal arts/ arts and letters ($17,358), and geology ($17,185).

Education majors/teachers ($16,903), journalism ($16,207), natural resources ($15,709), retailing/merchandising ($15,898), and human ecology/home economics ($15,635) complete the list.

The average starting salary (all disciplines) for bachelor's degree graduates is expected to be $21,601, for MBA/master's, $26,010, and for doctorates, $30,011.

Several employer categories are expecting to offer starting salary increases of 4.0% or greater to the 1985-86 graduating class. These include: merchandising and related services (retailing industries) (+4.5%); educational institutions (+4.3%); hotels, motels, resorts, and recreation facilities (+4.2%); aerospace and components (+4.1%); accounting (+4.0%); military (+4.0%); and tire and rubber products (+4.0%). (Pages 24-25)

Starting salary increases in the range of 3.0% to 3.9% include: food, beverage processing, and restaurants (+3.5%); diversified conglomerates (+3.5%); research and/or consulting services (+3.5%); construction and building materials manufacturing (+3.2%); and automotive and mechanical equipment (+3.1%).

Increases of 2.0% to 2.9% are anticipated for: service or volunteer organizations (+2.9%); public utilities, including transportation (+2.8%); hospitals and health services (+2.8%); banking, finance, and insurance (+2.7%); governmental administration (+2.6%); electronics and instruments (+2.3%); chemical, drugs and allied products (+2.3%); and petroleum and allied products (+2.2%).

Increases of 1.9% or less are expected from: metals and metal products (+1.9%); printing, publishing and information services (+1.4%); electrical machinery and equipment-computers (+1.3%); agribusiness (+1.3%); glass, paper, and packaging, and allied products (+1.0%); and communications-radio, television, and newspapers (0.0%).

Factors Considered When Calculating Starting Salary Offers

According to employers responding to this survey, previous part-time work experiences and high demand academic majors "sometimes" influence employer decisions when calculating starting salary offers. Other factors considered by employers are high grade point averages, prior military experiences, and quality of the college granting an individual's degree. (Page 29)

List Career Objectives on Resumes

Surveyed employers felt that entry-level candidates should state career objectives on their resumes. About 92% of the employers agreed with this recommendation. (Page 29)

Job Availability by Geographical Region

The greatest availability of jobs for new college graduates during 1985-86 will be in the southwestern region of the United States, according to employers responding to this survey. The southeastern and southcentral regions were rated next best on the employers' list of geographical areas for jobs. For the last two years, these regions have been ranked near this same order. (Page 30)

The best geographical regions for jobs in order of availability are expected to be: southwest, southeast, southcentral, northeast, northcentral, and northwest, according to surveyed employers.

Best Sources of New College Graduates

When prospective employers are seeking new college graduates, certain sources are more productive than others. For both graduating students planning their job campaigns and employers wanting to hire new graduates, this knowledge is very helpful. (Page 31-32)

According to employers responding to this survey, 45.9% of their new hires were obtained from on-campus interviewing, 11.5% from write-ins, 10.5% from want ads, 10.1% from job listings sent to placement offices, 8.4% from current employee referrals, and 7.0% from walk-ins.

Percentages obtained from other sources are: high demand academic major programs (4.5%), internship programs (4.4%), cooperative education programs (4.2%), summer employment programs (4.1%), referrals from college faculty and staff (3.7%), part-time employment programs (3.3%), unsolicited referrals from placement offices (2.6%), minority career programs (2.2%), job listings with employment agencies (2.4%), referrals from campus organizations (1.7%), and women's career programs (1.1%).

Grade Point Averages Are Considered

Employers responding to this survey indicated that over 70% of their new hires had grade point averages of 3.0 or better. The remaining employers, however, reported that their new hires had grade point averages of less that 3.0.

In recent years, it seems that grade point averages have become the main measuring stick for selecting candidates. And as data from this report indicate, most graduating students with high grade point averages are hired by prospective employers who conduct campus interviews.

Other Predictors of Job Success

When considering new college graduates for employment in their organizations, surveyed employers identify the most important predictors of job success as an ability to accept responsibility, communications abilities, maturity, motivational abilities, perseverance, speaking abilities, staying power and stability, organizational abilities when speaking, self-pride, and neatness. (Pages 34-35)

Receiving ratings of "medium" importance were team management skills, an example for others, competitive abilities, ability to go along with the organization, tactical and strategic planning skills, entrepreneurial spirit, physical fitness, ability to depend on other people, and the ability to work in close quarters.

Ratings of "low" importance were given to budgeting abilities, interest in family life, and good looks and youthfulness according to employers.

Screening Methods Used by Employers

When screening applicants for employment in their organizations, the surveyed employers indicated that personal interviews and resumes or summaries of work experiences were "always" used. (Page 36)

Other screening methods "almost always" used were: degree levels attained, reference checks, years of education, transcript checks, and grade point averages.

Used "sometimes" were: physical examinations and medical histories. "Seldom" used were ratings from training programs, blood tests, interviews with company doctors or nurses, ability/aptitude tests, pre-employment screenings for drugs, and job tryouts.

The surveyed employers "never" use assessment center analyses or comprehensive bio-inventories.

Reference Checking Procedures

Before graduating students are hired by most organizations, references from past employers and former supervisors are "almost always" checked. "Sometimes" checked are references from faculty members, personal references, and those from business associates. "Never" checked are references from clergy. (Page 37)

References are "almost always" checked verbally through telephone calls. "Sometimes" used to check references are written inquiries. "Seldom" used are police record checks or credit bureau checks. "Never" used are personal visits to references. Of the surveyed employers, 24 indicated that their organizations do not check any references before hiring new college graduates. (Page 37)

In the opinions of employers, candidates should generally list their references on resumes. Of those employers surveyed, 72% indicated that references should be listed while only 28% of the surveyed employers indicated that they should "seldom" or "never" be listed. (Page 38)

Describing Today's College Student

When describing today's college students, employers say that they are "almost always" career-oriented, friendly and pleasant, optimistic about their individual futures, interested in material success, competitive, and diverse in lifestyles and backgrounds. (Page 39)

College students are "sometimes" concerned with personal development, moderate in political attitudes, pragmatic, idealistic, liberal in social attitudes, self-concerned and me-oriented, disenchanted with politics, and weak in basic skills.

"Seldom" are college students pessimistic about the future of their country.

Prescreening Methods of Employers

Of the surveyed employers, 67.6% indicate that their organizations will pre-screen on college campuses where pre-screening is permitted. Last year, 69.2% of the surveyed employers expected to pre-screen. This slight decrease in percentage is statistically insignificant, so little or no change is expected in numbers of organizations pre-screening on college campuses this year. (Page 40)

Those factors considered most important to prospective employers when pre-screening candidates for initial campus interviews (those receiving ratings of "extremely high" or "high" importance) were: academic major, degree levels attained, major grade point average, previous work experiences, expected date of graduation, overall grade point average, and locational preferences.

Next on the employers' list of important factors (those with ratings of "medium" importance) were: stated career goals and college organizations and activities.

Closed Schedules Arranged By Employers

Of the employers surveyed, 35.7% indicated that closed schedules were requested on college campuses last year. This compares to 36.9% who requested closed schedules in 1983-84, a slight decrease, but not statistically significant. (Page 41)

During 1985-86, the surveyed employers expect to arrange about 1.7% more closed schedules. This increase is somewhat smaller than last year's increase of 4.7% more than 1983-84. (Page 41)

At colleges and universities where closed schedules are not permitted, surveyed employers expect to reduce their interviewing schedules by about 3.2%. In the words of surveyed employers, they will visit campuses where they receive the services they desire. (Page 41)

Hiring Efficiency

According to surveyed employers, 15.1% percent of the new college graduates interviewed last year (1984-85) by their organizations were hired. During 1983-84, 13.3% of those interviewed on campuses were hired. Thus employers are edging ever so slightly toward more efficient recruitment procedures. (Page 42)

Employers Interviewing Without Prospects of Jobs Available

According to the surveyed organizations, 63 employers (9.7%) visited college campuses last year and interviewed graduating students when their organizations expected no openings. (Page 43)

Choosing Colleges to Drop From the Recruiting Schedule

When dropping a college or university from their recruiting schedule, the surveyed employers reported that the following factors "almost always" influenced their decisions: a poor impression of students based on previous recruiting experiences and the organization's previous record of hires from the institution. "Sometimes" influencing their decisions were student indifference to previous recruiting efforts, reputation of the school, and a poor college placement center. (Page 43)

Signed Contracts Required by Some Employers

Over 53% of the surveyed employers thought that new college graduates should "never" be required to sign a contract stating that they would reimburse a specified amount to the employing organization if they left within a designated time period. Another 15% said that this should "seldom" be required, while 18% suggested that a contract should "sometimes" be required. Another 7% agreed "almost always" and 7% "always" with this reimbursement policy. (Page 44)

When questioned about the ethics of this practice, employers' responses were similar to those reported in the above inquiry. "Never" believing this practice was ethical were 42% of the respondents, 16% "seldom," 23% "sometimes," 9% "almost always," and 9% "always."

Of the respondents, 42 organizations (6.2%) were expecting to implement this policy within the next year or two. The other 638 organizations (93.8%) did not anticipate this policy change. (Page 44)

When commenting on signed contracts for new hires, one employer made an interesting analogy: Would an employer sign a contract to pay a specified amount to any new hire if the employer found reasons to terminate that individual within a designated time period? If not, then why should a new hire sign such a contract? This is an interesting point.

Many employers require new hires to reimburse their organizations for any relocation expenses if the individual terminates within a year or other designated time period. After that time, there is no obligation.

Another recruiter suggested that employers take full responsiblity for making good selections. If recruiters are properly trained to prescreen, interview, and match student qualifications with appropriate positions, then the risk of losing an employee should be minimal.

From another employer's perspective, a new employee who is displeased with an organization's training program or cannot continue employment with an organization for any reason should be terminated immediately without penalty. This employer would prefer a resignation to having an employee remain on the job for a "designated time period" because they were under contract, thus being unproductive, wasting training time, and perhaps using work time to search for new employment.

Time Allowed for Acceptance or Rejection of a Job Offer

The most prominent answer regarding time that should be allowed for prospective employees to accept or reject an offer was two weeks (40% responding with "always" or "almost always"). The other popular answer was one week (25% responding with "always" or "almost always"). Employers also responded that an applicant should "never" be required to accept or reject an offer immediately upon completion of the first interview. "Seldom" should candidates be required to accept or reject an offer within one day or two to five days. Employers also objected to candidates waiting until the completion of an interviewing season to make their decisions (59% responding that this should "seldom" or "never" be allowed). (Page 46)

Should Handicappers List Disabilities

Responses from employers were quite mixed when deciding if handicappers should list their disabilities on credentials and resumes. The consensus answer was that handicaps should be listed "sometimes". Recommending that handicaps not be listed were 11% of the employers with an answer of "always" and 16% with "almost always". Responding to the contrary were 19% with the answer of "seldom" agreeing and 22% who "never" agree that handicaps not be listed. (Page 47)

When advising handicappers on application procedures to follow when approaching their organizations, the surveyed employers "almost always" recommended interviewing on campus when their organizations are recruiting. "Sometimes" recommended were (1) applications sent directly to the department where the candidate's skills and talents will be best utilized, (2) direct contact with the personnel office with an explanation of the situation, and (3) applying through usual methods and not mentioning the handicap. "Never" recommended were the suggestions that (1) individuals find handicappers in the organization and use them as a contact person and (2) applying directly to the chief executive officer of the organization and explaining the situation in detail. (Page 47)

Factors Considered When Choosing Between Job Offers

In the opinions of employers, the most important factors considered by graduating students when choosing between several job offers were: reputation of the organization, challenging work assignment, opportunities for advancement, general reputation of the organization, competitive salary, job security, steady employment, geographical location of the job, and adequate benefits.

Factors with "medium" importance included: special demands of the position, personalities and abilities of supervisors, personalities and abilities of other workers, available graduate school nearby, talking with people who previously held the position, personnel problems within the organization, organizational structure, and physical facilities of the organization. Considered of "low" importance in the decision were other applicants for the position.

Tuition Payments for Attending Graduate School

Tuition for attending graduate school is paid in significantly varying amounts by employers responding to this survey. It was interesting to note, however, that educational institutions (19.9%) and accounting firms (19.5%) paid the least among employers responding to this question. (Pages 49-50)

Paying over 90% of graduate school tuition were military services (100%); tire and rubber products (100%); electronics and instruments (96.3%); chemicals, drugs, and allied products (95.5%); aerospace and components (92.1%); electrical machinery and equipment (91.4%); diversified conglomerates (90.6%); and automotive and mechancial equipment (90.0%).

Providing 70% to 89% of tuition for graduate school are public utilities including transportation (86.7%); metals and metal products (82.2%); construction and building materials manufacturers (79.1%); petroleum and allied products (79.0%); research and consulting services (78.9%); banking, finance, and insurance (74.4); and glass, paper, packaging, and allied products (71.4%).

Paying less than 70% of tuition expenses were agribusiness (60.0%); governmental administration (55.1%); printing, publishing, and information services (54.3%); service and volunteer organizations (51.8%); food, beverage processing, and restaurants (48.3%); hotels, motels, resorts and recreation facilities (36.8%); hospitals and health services (32.9%); merchandising and retail services (28.5%); educational institutions (19.9%); and accounting firms (19.5%).

Reneging on Job Offers

Organizations responding to this year's survey indicated that over half of them (50.7%) had graduating students renege on offers of employment last year. In 340 organizations who reported reneges, a total of 1,766 cases were reported. From these data, it is evident that many graduating students are accepting employment with more than one organization or continuing to interview after accepting a jo offer. (Page 51)

In the opinion of 531 organizations (77.5%) responding to this survey, it is not ethical for students to interview with other organizations after they have accepted an offer of employment. With the opposite viewpoint, 154 of the surveyed organizations (22.5%) thought it was ethical to continue to interview after accepting a job offer. (Page 52)

Problems Experienced by New Hires

The most serious problems employers found with graduating students after they had accepted an offer of employment with an organization are (1) individuals reneging on job offers and (2) locating adequate living accommodations for new hires. Both these problems had "medium" frequencies. (Page 52)

Those problems with "low" frequencies were: requests for renegotiation of starting salaries, educational opportunities, spouse relocation, other benefits, transportation, changes of starting dates, requests regarding recreational facilities, and loans.

The most frequent difficulty experienced by graduating students when beginning work with organizations was an expectation of premature advancement. This difficulty was only "sometimes" cited as a problem.

All other difficulties were "seldom" experienced and included: absenteeism; a strong work ethic; organization policies; routine work; transfer to new location or job; travelling when required by the job; family matters not related to the job; technical expertise required; accomplishing assigned work; understanding the job task; satisfaction with salary offer; vacation requests exceeding standard; getting along with the boss; getting along with other employees; understanding chain of command; physical environment of the job; intelligence required for the job; common sense to perform the job; leadership abilities required on the job; and personal values versus the organization's values.

Characteristics of an Excellent College Relations Program

It takes certain characteristics to make a college relations and recruiting program truly outstanding, according to the surveyed employers. "Almost always" important are: communications abilities; selection of proper college relations staff; interviewing techniques; knowledge of organizational opportunities; selection of campus representatives; contacts with faculty, deans, and others; selection of schools; familiarity with academic programs; comprehensive campus visitations; knowledge of competition; a major liaison person for each college; co-op, internship, and summer employment; and a training program for recruiters. (Pages 54-55)

"Sometimes" important are: availability of student lists/resume books, special programs for minorities and women, prescreening/bird dogging strategies, promotion programs, computerized record systems, especially for large organizations, membership in professional associations (CPC, MCPA, etc.), scholarships, research by the personnel section, grants, student newspaper (contacts and advertisements), and a speaker's bureau.

All the characteristics mentioned in this question were cited as "almost always" or "sometimes" important. None of the characteristics were rated as "seldom" or "never" important.

Description of an Excellent Campus Interviewer

A good campus interviewer must possess certain characteristics and perform specific practices, if they expect to achieve their organization's recruiting goals, according to employers responding to this survey. "Extremely important" are the following: listening to what is said and appearing interested in the individual. (Pages 56-57)

Factors of "high" importance according to employers are: a sincere attitude, being tactful and polite, being well-organized, reviewing resumes and transcripts before the interview, giving candidates sufficient time to express themselves, being concerned with the candidate's career paths, having a good appearance, reviewing jobs available before interviewing, providing interaction without general questions, being well-organized without obvious structure, having a good sense of humor, and being an individual at the administrative or management level.

Less important, but still deserving "medium" attention, are individuals from line positions and someone with a highly structured interview format.

"Low" importance was given to the interviewer being close to the age of interviewees, of matching ethnic origins and being of the same sex as the interviewees.

Trends in Hiring of Coop and Summer Employees

Cooperative education and summer internship experiences are expected to increase by about 2.8% in the surveyed employer organizations during 1985-86. This was a comparison with cooperative education and summer internships available in surveyed organizations during 1984-85. (Page 57)

Evidently summer employment opportunities and cooperative education positions are very good recruitment programs for full-time employment, since 46.8% of the individuals in these positions typically accept job offers with the organizations where they held such assignments. This was the report from surveyed employers. As advice to college students, they should obtain a summer internship or cooperative education position with an organization, if they can. Then their chances are almost 50% of landing a full-time job offer with that organization after graduation. (Page 58)

Turnover Among New College Hires

According to surveyed employers, technical graduates leave surveyed organizations at the rate of 4.2% during the first year, 6.4% during the second year, and 8.4% during the third year. (Page 59)

Non-technical graduates are more likely than technical graduates to leave during the first year (5.1%) and less likely during the second (6.0%) and third years (6.9%). Possibly non-technical graduates are placed in positions that do not closely match their career interests, so they are more likely to leave the first year. Also, job opportunities are not as plentiful for non-technical graduates (compared to job availability for technical graduates), so they are less likely to leave during the second and third years. (Page 60)

Measures of an Effective College Placement Service

In the opinions of surveyed employers, it is most important (rated as "high" importance) that effective placement services include: arranging campus interviews, advising on career planning, providing employer literature, operating career information centers, offering job campaign assistance, publishing job vacancy listings, operating programs for cooperative education and internships, providing pre-screening services, operating student employment services, providing special programs and services for summer employment, publishing salary reports, publishing supply and demand studies, holding career fairs, operating fresh graduate programs, providing workshops and courses on employment, operating credential referral services, publishing recruiting trends studies, listing and supporting part-time employment services, supporting minority recruitment programs, and providing experienced candidate/alumni referral programs. (Pages 60-61)

Moderately important (rated as "medium" important) are services for graduate school information, women's programs, distribution of placement annuals, follow-up reports, special services for handicappers and special groups, business career programs, career and job campaigning books, high school and college lectures, video tapes on careers and other job placement topics, volunteer services, government employment programs, and military options programs.

When commenting about improvements needed in placement services offered by colleges and universities, several employers suggested a continuation of current procedures. According to these employers most placement offices are always cooperative and accommodating, and they feel this genuine interest should be maintained.

However, surveyed employers indicated that colleges could better prepare students for the "real world" of employment. Too many students have unrealistic expectations for starting salaries, time frames for promotions, and where they "fit" in an organization.

Work experiences play a key role in hiring decisions and some students aren't willing to start in positions that will allow them to gain valuable experiences. They want to start at the top. Encourage students to participate in internship and other work experience programs prior to graduation. This is a growing trend and will be strongly considered when students are ready to start their careers.

A continuing effort should be exerted to bring more employers to campus. Campuses that *care* and take a sincere interest in their students, recruiters and employers will *always* be successful, according to the surveyed employers.

Which category best describes your organization, and how many SALARIED employees (excluding clerical staff) are on the payroll of your organization? Absolute frequencies are listed for each answer on the first line, percentages of totals on the second line, row percentages on the third line, and column percentages on the fourth line of each block.

Employer
Categories

FREQUENCY PERCENT ROW PCT COL PCT	Number of Salaried Employees						
	1-99	100-499	500-999	1000-4999	5000-9999	10,000+	TOTAL
ACCOUNTING	8	11	0	3	1	1	24
	1.13	1.55	0.00	0.42	0.14	0.14	3.38
	33.33	45.83	0.00	12.50	4.17	4.17	
	10.00	6.32	0.00	1.46	1.64	1.25	
AEROSPACE	0	2	2	9	2	5	20
	0.00	0.28	0.28	1.27	0.28	0.70	2.82
	0.00	10.00	10.00	45.00	10.00	25.00	
	0.00	1.15	1.82	4.39	3.28	6.25	
AGRIBUSINESS	5	0	2	3	0	0	10
	0.70	0.00	0.28	0.42	0.00	0.00	1.41
	50.00	0.00	20.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	
	6.25	0.00	1.82	1.46	0.00	0.00	
AUTOMOTIVE	2	8	2	7	0	4	23
	0.28	1.13	0.28	0.99	0.00	0.56	3.24
	8.70	34.78	8.70	30.43	0.00	17.39	
	2.50	4.60	1.82	3.41	0.00	5.00	
BANKING FIN	7	7	15	20	4	5	58
	0.99	0.99	2.11	2.82	0.56	0.70	8.17
	12.07	12.07	25.86	34.48	6.90	8.62	
	8.75	4.02	13.64	9.76	6.56	6.25	
CHEMICALS	3	4	2	6	8	12	35
	0.42	0.56	0.28	0.85	1.13	1.69	4.93
	8.57	11.43	5.71	17.14	22.86	34.29	
	3.75	2.30	1.82	2.93	13.11	15.00	
COMMUNICATION	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.28
	0.00	50.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	
	0.00	0.57	0.00	0.49	0.00	0.00	
CONSTRUCTION	3	9	4	6	3	1	26
	0.42	1.27	0.56	0.85	0.42	0.14	3.66
	11.54	34.62	15.38	23.08	11.54	3.85	
	3.75	5.17	3.64	2.93	4.92	1.25	
EDUCATION	8	36	28	35	7	2	116
	1.13	5.07	3.94	4.93	0.99	0.28	16.34
	6.90	31.03	24.14	30.17	6.03	1.72	
	10.00	20.69	25.45	17.07	11.48	2.50	
TOTAL	80	174	110	205	61	80	710
	11.27	24.51	15.49	28.87	8.59	11.27	100.00

(Continued)

Continued. . .

Employer
Categories

FREQUENCY PERCENT ROW PCT COL PCT	Number of Salaried Employees						
	1-99	100-499	500-999	1000-4999	5000-9999	10,000+	TOTAL
ELECTR MACH	2 0.28 8.70 2.50	7 0.99 30.43 4.02	3 0.42 13.04 2.73	5 0.70 21.74 2.44	3 0.42 13.04 4.92	3 0.42 13.04 3.75	23 3.24
ELECTRONICS	5 0.70 11.63 6.25	12 1.69 27.91 6.90	4 0.56 9.30 3.64	12 1.69 27.91 5.85	2 0.28 4.65 3.28	8 1.13 18.60 10.00	43 6.06
RESTAURANTS	6 0.85 16.22 7.50	12 1.69 32.43 6.90	5 0.70 13.51 4.55	7 0.99 18.92 3.41	2 0.28 5.41 3.28	5 0.70 13.51 6.25	37 5.21
PACKAGING	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.28 25.00 1.15	1 0.14 12.50 0.91	2 0.28 25.00 0.98	2 0.28 25.00 3.28	1 0.14 12.50 1.25	8 1.13
GOVERNMENT	5 0.70 15.15 6.25	2 0.28 6.06 1.15	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	11 1.55 33.33 5.37	8 1.13 24.24 13.11	7 0.99 21.21 8.75	33 4.65
HOSPITALS	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	3 0.42 37.50 1.72	1 0.14 12.50 0.91	3 0.42 37.50 1.46	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.14 12.50 1.25	8 1.13
HOTELS MOTELS	6 0.85 42.86 7.50	3 0.42 21.43 1.72	3 0.42 21.43 2.73	1 0.14 7.14 0.49	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.14 7.14 1.25	14 1.97
MERCHANDISING	3 0.42 8.82 3.75	14 1.97 41.18 8.05	6 0.85 17.65 5.45	9 1.27 26.47 4.39	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.28 5.88 2.50	34 4.79
METALS PRODS	4 0.56 13.33 5.00	10 1.41 33.33 5.75	6 0.85 20.00 5.45	7 0.99 23.33 3.41	3 0.42 10.00 4.92	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	30 4.23
TOTAL	80 11.27	174 24.51	110 15.49	205 28.87	61 8.59	80 11.27	710 100.00

(Continued)

Continued. . .

Employer
Categories

FREQUENCY PERCENT ROW PCT COL PCT	Number of Salaried Employees						
	1-99	100-499	500-999	1000-4999	5000-9999	10,000+	TOTAL
MILITARY	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.28 50.00 1.82	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.14 25.00 1.64	1 0.14 25.00 1.25	4 0.56
PETROLEUM	1 0.14 5.00 1.25	5 0.70 25.00 2.87	1 0.14 5.00 0.91	7 0.99 35.00 3.41	2 0.28 10.00 3.28	4 0.56 20.00 5.00	20 2.82
PRINTING PUBL	1 0.14 14.29 1.25	2 0.28 28.57 1.15	1 0.14 14.29 0.91	3 0.42 42.86 1.46	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	7 0.99
UTILITIES	3 0.42 4.55 3.75	5 0.70 7.58 2.87	12 1.69 18.18 10.91	28 3.94 42.42 13.66	10 1.41 15.15 16.39	8 1.13 12.12 10.00	66 9.30
RESEARCH	3 0.42 7.89 3.75	12 1.69 31.58 6.90	7 0.99 18.42 6.36	13 1.83 34.21 6.34	2 0.28 5.26 3.28	1 0.14 2.63 1.25	38 5.35
SERV VOL ORGS	4 0.56 36.36 5.00	3 0.42 27.27 1.72	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	4 0.56 36.36 1.95	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	11 1.55
TIRE RUBBER	1 0.14 50.00 1.25	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.14 50.00 1.25	2 0.28
CONGLOMERATES	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	4 0.56 22.22 2.30	3 0.42 16.67 2.73	3 0.42 16.67 1.46	1 0.14 5.56 1.64	7 0.99 38.89 8.75	18 2.54
TOTAL	80 11.27	174 24.51	110 15.49	205 28.87	61 8.59	80 11.27	710 100.00

Observations: Responses to the 1985-86 Recruiting Trends survey were received from 710 employers representing businesses, industries, governmental agencies, and educational institutions. Of the respondents, 78.5% were businesses and industries, 16.3% educational institutions, and 5.2% governmental agencies and military services.

Organizations with 10,000 or more employees represent 11.3% of the respondents, those with five to ten thousand employees were 8.6% of the respondents, and organizations with a thousand to five thousand employees represent 28.9% of the respondents. Organizations with five hundred to a thousand employees were represented by 15.5% of the respondents, those with 100 to 499 employees by 24.5% of the respondents, and those with one to ninety-nine employees were represented by 11.3% of the respondents.

These numbers display the diversity of employers included in this survey.

In the LAST YEAR (1984-85), what change, if any, has occurred in the number of SALARIED employees working for your organization?

CHANGE IN SALARIED EMPLOYEES LAST YEAR																	
INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 25-49	DEC. 50-100	TOTAL	WEIGHTED
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
7	41	34	43	44	56	93	177	53	26	29	10	26	17	3	3	662	1.7

Observations: Since changes in numbers of salaried employees working for surveyed employers can be a good indication of hiring intentions, employers responding to this year's survey were questioned regarding salaried employees working for their organizations last year.

These employers reported a net increase of 1.7% in numbers of salaried employees last year. This compares to an increase of 1.5% in 1983-84 and a decrease of 1.4% during 1982-83. During the last two years, surveyed employers have increased the numbers of salaried employees working for their organizations by very slight amounts, after cutting their organizations to the bone in 1982-83.

In the LAST YEAR (1984-85), what change, if any, has occurred in the number of SALARIED employees working for your organization?

	CHANGE IN SALARIED EMPLOYEES LAST YEAR																	
	INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 25-49	DEC. 50-100	TOT-AL	WEI-GHT-ED
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
.....EMPLOYER CATEGORIES																		
ACCOUNTING	1	5	3	1	5	1	.	2	1	1	.	.	.	2	.	.	22	8.7
AEROSPACE & COMPONENTS	1	.	3	2	4	2	1	2	1	.	1	1	.	1	.	.	19	4.7
AGRIBUSINESS	.	.	2	.	.	.	.	4	1	1	.	.	.	1	.	.	9	-1.2
AUTOMOTIVE AND MECH EQUIPMENT	.	.	.	2	.	4	2	4	1	1	3	1	4	.	.	.	22	-1.6
BANKING, FINANCE & INSURANCE	.	2	5	2	7	4	8	16	1	4	1	.	1	.	.	1	52	1.1
CHEMICALS, DRUGS, ALLIED PROD	.	2	3	1	.	2	8	8	1	.	3	.	1	1	.	.	30	1.9
COMM (RADIO, TV, & NEWSPAPR)	.	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	16.5
CONSTRUCTION & BUILDING MATLS	.	3	.	2	4	1	1	4	2	1	2	.	3	.	.	.	23	3.1
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS	.	1	3	8	4	8	25	42	14	4	1	.	.	.	.	.	110	1.6
ELECTR MACH & EQUIP (COMPTR)	1	1	.	1	2	2	1	2	3	.	2	.	2	1	1	1	20	-5.3
ELECTRONICS & INSTRUMENTS	2	7	2	1	3	4	3	9	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	41	3.3
FOOD, BEVERAGE PROC, & RESTR	1	4	2	7	1	4	6	6	3	.	1	.	.	1	.	.	36	6.2
GLASS, PKG, & ALLIED PRODUCTS	.	1	.	.	.	1	1	1	.	1	2	.	.	1	.	.	8	-1.3
GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	.	1	1	3	2	2	6	15	1	1	.	.	1	.	.	.	33	2.3
HOSPITALS & HEALTH SERVICES	.	.	1	2	.	2	1	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	8	4.5
HOTELS, MOTELS, RESORTS & REC	.	2	.	.	1	1	.	6	1	.	.	.	2	1	.	.	14	0.9
MERCHANDISING & RETAIL SERVS	.	3	2	.	2	3	4	12	1	.	1	1	.	1	.	.	30	2.9
METALS & METAL PRODUCTS	.	2	1	4	2	2	1	4	4	3	3	.	1	.	.	.	27	2.4
MILITARY SERVICES	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	2.0
PETROLEUM & ALLIED PRODUCTS	1	.	1	.	.	2	2	3	2	1	1	2	4	.	.	.	19	0.1
PRINTING, PUBL & INFO SERVICES	.	.	1	1	1	1	1	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	7	4.3
PUBLIC UTILITIES INCL TRANSPO	.	.	2	2	3	5	15	16	7	3	5	1	2	1	1	.	63	-0.9
RESEARCH & CONSULTING SERVICES	.	4	2	4	2	3	4	8	3	3	1	.	2	1	.	.	37	3.1
SERVICE & VOLUNTEER ORGANZATNS	.	2	.	.	1	.	2	4	.	.	.	1	.	1	.	.	11	2.5
TIRE & RUBBER PRODUCTS	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	-4.0
DIVERSIFIED CONGLOMERATES	.	1	.	.	.	2	2	2	4	.	.	1	2	2	.	.	16	-3.1

Continued. . .

Observations: On the average, salaried employees increased by 1.7% during 1984-85 in surveyed organizations, but responses varied significantly among these employers. Some organizations gained employees while others lost.

Organizations with significant increases in salaried employees last year include accounting (9.3%); food, beverage processing, and restaurants (6.4%); aerospace and components (4.7%); hospitals and health services (4.5%); printing, publishing, and informational services (4.3%); construction and building materials manufacturers (3.2%); electronics and instruments (3.3%); research and consulting services (3.1%); merchandising and retail services (2.9%); service and volunteer organizations (2.5%); governmental administration (2.3%); metals and metal products (2.2); and military services (2.0%).

Moderate increases were experienced by the following organizations: chemicals, drugs, and allied products (1.9%); educational institutions (1.6%); banking, finance and insurance (1.2%); hotels, motels, resorts and recreational services (0.9%); and petroleum and allied products (0.1%).

Decreases in salaried employees occurred in electrical machinery and equipment (-5.9%); glass, paper, packaging and allied products (-5.0%); tire & rubber products (-4.0%); diversified conglomerates (-3.1%); automotive and mechanical equipment (-1.6%); agribusiness (-1.2%); and public utilities including transportation (-0.9%).

This year (1985-86), what change, if any, do you anticipate in the number of SALARIED employees working for your organization?

CHANGE IN SALARIED EMPLOYEES FOR 1985-86																	
INC. 50+	INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 50-100	TOTAL	WEIGHTED
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
3	4	29	33	20	58	68	119	222	51	24	21	5	13	4	1	675	2.8

Observations: During 1985-86, a moderate (2.8%) increase is expected in numbers of salaried employees working for surveyed employers. This compares to an expected increase of 3.5% in 1982-83, which yielded an actual increase of 1.7% last year. From these data, it is evident that a very cautious increase can be expected during 1985-86 in numbers of salaried employees.

This year (1985-86), what change, if any, do you anticipate in the number of SALARIED employees working for your organization?

	CHANGE IN SALARIED EMPLOYEES FOR 1985-86																	
	INC. 50+	INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 50-100	TOTAL	WEIGHTED
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
.....EMPLOYER CATEGORIES																		
ACCOUNTING	.	.	4	5	1	4	1	1	5	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	21	9.0
AEROSPACE & COMPONENTS	.	.	1	2	1	2	4	3	5	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	19	4.3
AGRIBUSINESS	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	2	3	.	2	.	.	.	1	.	10	0.6
AUTOMOTIVE AND MECH EQUIPMENT	.	.	.	.	.	.	4	1	8	2	.	1	1	4	.	.	21	-1.9
BANKING, FINANCE & INSURANCE	1	.	1	4	2	6	5	13	14	2	1	.	1	1	.	.	51	4.6
CHEMICALS, DRUGS, ALLIED PROD	.	.	1	.	1	2	4	7	16	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	33	2.0
COMM (RADIO, TV, & NEWSPAPR)	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	10.0
CONSTRUCTION & BUILDING MATLS	.	1	.	1	2	3	1	6	4	2	.	1	.	.	1	.	22	3.4
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS	.	.	1	5	1	6	11	35	38	8	4	.	.	1	.	.	110	1.7
ELECTR MACH & EQUIP (COMPTR)	.	.	1	1	.	3	3	.	3	3	1	2	.	.	1	1	19	-4.3
ELECTRONICS & INSTRUMENTS	.	1	2	2	3	7	4	4	13	.	1	4	.	.	.	.	41	4.4
FOOD, BEVERAGE PROC, & RESTR	1	1	4	3	2	3	5	7	6	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	33	10.3
GLASS, PKG, & ALLIED PRODUCTS	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	4	1	.	.	1	.	.	.	7	-0.9
GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	.	.	.	.	1	3	4	5	15	4	1	.	.	.	.	.	33	1.2
HOSPITALS & HEALTH SERVICES	.	.	.	2	2	1	1	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	8	5.8
HOTELS, MOTELS, RESORTS & REC	1	.	2	1	.	.	1	1	6	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	14	11.4
MERCHANDISING & RETAIL SERVS	.	.	4	2	.	2	3	6	12	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	30	5.1
METALS & METAL PRODUCTS	.	.	2	.	1	1	2	4	10	3	1	2	2	.	.	.	28	1.5
MILITARY SERVICES	.	.	.	.	.	2	.	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	4	3.0
PETROLEUM & ALLIED PRODUCTS	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	2	7	4	3	.	.	1	1	.	19	-2.2
PRINTING, PUBL & INFO SERVICES	.	.	.	.	.	1	2	1	2	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	7	1.4
PUBLIC UTILITIES INCL TRANSPO	.	.	1	.	.	3	3	9	28	11	3	3	.	3	.	.	64	-0.1
RESEARCH & CONSULTING SERVICES	.	.	3	1	2	7	4	4	9	5	1	2	.	.	.	.	38	3.7
SERVICE & VOLUNTEER ORGANZATNS	.	1	1	1	.	2	1	1	3	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	11	8.5
TIRE & RUBBER PRODUCTS	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	4.0
DIVERSIFIED CONGLOMERATES	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	4	2	3	3	1	.	2	.	.	17	-1.6

Continued. . .

Observations: Increases in salaried employees on payrolls of surveyed employees are expected at the rate of 2.8%, on the average, during 1985-86, but the changes in salaried employees will vary significantly from employer to employer.

Anticipating the greatest increases in salaried employees were hotels, motels, resorts and recreational facilities (11.4%); food, beverage processing, and restaurants (10.3%); and communication-radio, TV, and newspapers (10.0%). These were followed closely by accounting (9.0%); service and volunteer organizations (8.5%); hospitals and health services (5.8%); merchandising and retail services (5.1%); banking, finance and insurance (4.6%); electronics and instruments (4.4%); aerospace and components (4.3%); tire and rubber products (4.0%); research and consulting services (3.7%); construction and building materials manufacturing (3.4%); and military services (3.0%).

Moderate increases in salaried employees were anticipated in chemicals, drugs, and allied products (2.0%); educational institutions (1.7%); metals and metal products (1.5%); printing, publishing, and informational services (1.4%); governmental administration (1.2%); and agribusiness (0.6%).

Those expecting no increases or even declines in salaried employees were public utilities including transportation (-0.1%); glass, packaging and allied products (-0.9%); diversified conglomerates (-1.6%); automotive and mechanical equipment (-1.9%); petroleum and allied products (-2.2%); and electrical machinery and equipment-computers (-4.3%).

How many new college graduates were hired by your organization last year (1984-85) for professional positions?

Numbers of
New Hires

Number of Salaried Employees

FREQUENCY ROW PCT	1-99	100-499	500-999	1000-4999	5000-9999	10,000+	TOTAL
NO RESPONSE	16 .	12 .	4 .	5 .	5 .	2 .	.
NONE HIRED	20 28.99	26 37.68	9 13.04	12 17.39	1 1.45	1 1.45	69
1-19	43 17.55	94 38.37	53 21.63	47 19.18	3 1.22	5 2.04	245
20-49	0 0.00	31 22.96	25 18.52	63 46.67	10 7.41	6 4.44	135
50-99	0 0.00	9 10.00	14 15.56	42 46.67	16 17.78	9 10.00	90
100-149	0 0.00	2 5.88	4 11.76	13 38.24	8 23.53	7 20.59	34
150-199	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 4.17	10 41.67	6 25.00	7 29.17	24
200-299	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	5 27.78	5 27.78	8 44.44	18
300-499	1 4.76	0 0.00	0 0.00	8 38.10	3 14.29	9 42.86	21
500-999	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 13.33	13 86.67	15
1000 OR MORE	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 13.33	13 86.67	15
TOTAL	64	162	106	200	56	78	666

Sum of New Hires = 66,012 Mean = 105

Observations: Employers responding to this year's survey hired a total of 66,012 new college graduates last year. This compares to 60,076 hired in 1983-84 by 499 employers who hired new college graduates. On the average, each of 597 employer hired 105 new college graduates last year.

No new college graduates were hired during 1984-85 by 69 of 710 organizations responding to this year's survey. This compared to 80 of 658 organizations who hired none in 1983-84.

How many new college graduates does your organization expect to hire this year (1985-86) for professional positions?

Number of
New Hires

Number of Salaried Employees

FREQUENCY ROW PCT	1-99	100-499	500-999	1000-4999	5000-9999	10,000+	TOTAL
NO RESPONSE	12 .	7 .	5 .	6 .	5 .	4 .	.
NONE HIRED	26 36.11	22 30.56	9 12.50	13 18.06	1 1.39	1 1.39	72
1-19	39 16.05	101 41.56	51 20.99	48 19.75	2 0.82	2 0.82	243
20-49	2 1.37	33 22.60	26 17.81	64 43.84	14 9.59	7 4.79	146
50-99	0 0.00	8 10.00	13 16.25	37 46.25	12 15.00	10 12.50	80
100-149	0 0.00	2 5.88	5 14.71	13 38.24	6 17.65	8 23.53	34
150-199	0 0.00	1 4.17	0 0.00	6 25.00	9 37.50	8 33.33	24
200-299	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 4.55	12 54.55	3 13.64	6 27.27	22
300-499	1 5.56	0 0.00	0 0.00	4 22.22	4 22.22	9 50.00	18
500-999	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 5.56	3 16.67	14 77.78	18
1000 OR MORE	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 7.14	2 14.29	11 78.57	14
TOTAL	68	167	105	199	56	76	671

Sum of Expected New Hires = 67,347 Mean = 109

Observations: The total hiring quota for new college graduates this year among 619 organizations expecting to hire was reported as 67,347. This compares to an anticipated goal of 66,500 in 1984-85 for 514 of 658 organizations responding to last year's survey. The actual number of new hires last year for 597 of 710 organizations surveyed was 66,012. This year, 72 organizations expect to hire no new college graduates, compared to 69 who indicated no new college hires last year.

For 1984-85, what percent of your offers of employment to new TECHNICAL college graduates were accepted?

Percent
Accepted

Number of Salaried Employees

FREQUENCY ROW PCT	1-99	100-499	500-999	1000-4999	5000-9999	10,000+	TOTAL
NO RESPONSE	48 .	89 .	50 .	70 .	16 .	17 .	.
NONE HIRED	9 24.32	10 27.03	2 5.41	12 32.43	0 0.00	4 10.81	37
1-9%	2 13.33	3 20.00	2 13.33	4 26.67	2 13.33	2 13.33	15
10-19%	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	3 60.00	1 20.00	1 20.00	5
20-29%	1 12.50	1 12.50	1 12.50	2 25.00	2 25.00	1 12.50	8
30-39%	0 0.00	4 18.18	6 27.27	7 31.82	3 13.64	2 9.09	22
40-49%	0 0.00	3 6.67	2 4.44	14 31.11	9 20.00	17 37.78	45
50-59%	2 3.77	6 11.32	9 16.98	15 28.30	10 18.87	11 20.75	53
60-69%	0 0.00	6 16.67	3 8.33	14 38.89	5 13.89	8 22.22	36
70-79%	2 4.00	9 18.00	6 12.00	18 36.00	7 14.00	8 16.00	50
80-89%	3 5.00	16 26.67	14 23.33	20 33.33	3 5.00	4 6.67	60
90-99%	1 2.63	7 18.42	7 18.42	18 47.37	2 5.26	3 7.89	38
100%	12 23.53	20 39.22	8 15.69	8 15.69	1 1.96	2 3.92	51
TOTAL	32	85	60	135	45	63	420

Mean = 59.7%

Observations: Although numbers of new college graduates hired by surveyed employers are an excellent measure of past job market trends, percent of job offers accepted is another. Of the new technical college graduates recruited during 1984-85 by surveyed employers, 59.7% accepted offers of employment with the surveyed employers. This compares to an acceptance rate of 59.0% in 1983-84 and 60.1% in 1982-83. If this change in rate is significant at all, it indicates a slight improvement in the recruitment techniques of employers, so a slightly higher percentage of technical graduates interviewed on campuses are accepting job offers, or each graduate is receiving fewer offers, thus lessening the rejection rate.

For 1984-85, what percent of your offers of employment to NON-TECHNICAL college graduates were accepted?

Percent
Accepted

Number of Salaried Employees

FREQUENCY ROW PCT	1-99	100-499	500-999	1000-4999	5000-9999	10,000+	TOTAL
NO RESPONSE	47 .	76 .	38 .	68 .	20 .	19 .	.
NONE HIRED	5 14.71	12 35.29	7 20.59	8 23.53	1 2.94	1 2.94	34
1-9%	1 100.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1
10-19%	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 50.00	1 25.00	1 25.00	4
20-29%	1 12.50	2 25.00	3 37.50	1 12.50	1 12.50	0 0.00	8
30-39%	0 0.00	4 22.22	3 16.67	4 22.22	4 22.22	3 16.67	18
40-49%	0 0.00	4 22.22	4 22.22	3 16.67	4 22.22	3 16.67	18
50-59%	5 12.20	7 17.07	5 12.20	8 19.51	5 12.20	11 26.83	41
60-69%	1 2.50	5 12.50	4 10.00	15 37.50	7 17.50	8 20.00	40
70-79%	0 0.00	5 8.33	10 16.67	25 41.67	7 11.67	13 21.67	60
80-89%	2 3.64	11 20.00	13 23.64	12 21.82	7 12.73	10 18.18	55
90-99%	4 6.56	11 18.03	9 14.75	28 45.90	3 4.92	6 9.84	61
100%	14 13.73	37 36.27	14 13.73	31 30.39	1 0.98	5 4.90	102
TOTAL	33	98	72	137	41	61	442

Mean = 68.2%

Observations: Offers of employment to non-technical college graduates were accepted at the rate of 68.2% during 1984-85. This compares to an acceptance rate of 68.5% in 1983-84 and 65.3% in 1982-83. A slight increase in the acceptance rate was noted between 1982-83 and 1983-84, indicating the slight erosion in the job market for non-technical graduates during that time. No significant change was reported between the 1983-84 and 1984-85 job markets for non-technical graduates.

This year (1985-86), what change, if any, does your organization anticipate in the hiring of new college graduates?

	ANTICIPATED CHANGE IN HIRING																	
	INC. 50+	INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 25-49	TOTAL	WEIGHTED
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
BACHELORS GRADUATES	71	80	75	93	44	136	230	481	7470	50	65	31	7	45	49	37	8964	1.4

Observations: During 1985-86, surveyed employers expect to hire about 1.4% more bachelor's degree graduates than they hired during 1984-85. This compares to an expected increase of 9.2% last year and 5.0% in 1983-84. From these data, it is evident that this year's job market for college graduates will increase only slightly from last year's.

	PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN HIRING																		
	INC. 50+	INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 25-49	DEC. 50-100	TOTAL	WEIGHTED
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
.....TYPES OF GRADUATES																			
WOMEN GRADUATES	12	17	20	24	6	31	33	55	308	7	2	4	1	1	4	4	4	533	4.7
MINORITY GRADUATES	17	12	23	40	11	45	43	68	255	2	.	3	.	1	4	3	2	529	6.5
MBA/MS GRADUATES	7	7	4	7	4	6	24	34	284	5	4	1	1	3	1	2	12	406	0.2
DOCTORAL GRADUATES	4	4	2	1	3	5	9	16	297	5	1	.	.	3	2	1	10	363	-1.0

For minorities, quotas are expected to increase 6.5%, and for women graduates, 4.7%. These quotas compare to last year's increases of 10.2% and 7.7%, respectively.

MBA and master's graduates can expect almost no increases in quotas (+0.1%), and doctoral candidates can expect a decrease of 1.0%. These quotas are down from 1984-85 goals of +2.7% and +0.7%, respectively.

This year (1985-86), what change, if any, does your organization anticipate in the hiring of new college graduates? Responses are listed for each ACADEMIC MAJOR at the bachelor's degree level.

	ANTICIPATED CHANGE IN HIRING																		
	INC. 50+	INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 25-49	TOT-AL	WEI-GHT-ED
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
.....ACADEMIC MAJORS																		
AGRICULTURE	.	1	1	1	2	.	2	1	274	.	1	2	.	1	1	1	288	0.0
NATURAL RESOURCES	.	1	.	1	1	2	1	2	277	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	287	0.3
ACCOUNTING	9	3	6	7	3	5	16	34	290	7	2	3	2	2	6	3	398	2.7
FINANCIAL ADMIN	.	2	4	1	.	4	10	23	278	4	2	1	.	.	3	1	333	0.5
GEN BUS ADMIN	2	5	3	6	1	8	8	26	272	2	6	1	.	1	3	2	346	1.5
HOTEL REST INST MGT	3	3	3	2	.	2	4	9	251	.	.	.	.	1	1	1	280	1.8
MARKETING/SALES	4	7	5	10	5	13	17	33	250	.	2	3	1	5	3	2	360	2.7
PERSONNEL	2	3	2	.	1	3	4	29	274	2	5	1	.	2	2	2	332	0.9
ADVERTISING	.	1	.	.	.	4	2	8	282	.	.	2	.	.	.	.	299	0.3
COMMUNICATIONS	.	1	1	2	.	1	4	10	279	1	1	.	.	.	1	1	302	0.2
JOURNALISM	.	1	.	1	.	1	2	6	287	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	299	0.2
TELECOMMUNICATION	.	1	.	3	1	.	3	13	267	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	288	0.4
EDUCATION	5	1	2	1	1	7	14	32	271	3	3	.	1	.	.	2	343	1.9
CHEMICAL ENGR	6	4	2	2	.	9	10	19	261	1	3	1	.	5	3	5	331	1.8
CIVIL ENGR	3	1	3	2	2	2	9	7	268	2	3	.	.	1	2	1	306	1.3
COMPUTER SCIENCE	8	5	10	15	4	20	25	44	231	2	6	1	.	4	6	2	383	3.8
ELECTRICAL ENGR	8	12	7	11	4	16	25	31	242	3	3	4	.	4	6	5	381	3.9
INDUSTRIAL ENGR	5	6	3	4	3	5	8	20	259	2	5	2	.	1	1	.	324	3.0
MECHANICAL ENGR	8	10	6	11	5	12	19	40	247	5	6	3	.	6	8	4	390	3.4
METALLURGY MATERIALS SCIENCE	3	1	5	1	.	5	6	9	265	.	4	1	.	2	2	.	304	1.5
HUMAN ECOL/HOME ECONOMICS	.	1	2	.	.	.	1	8	269	2	.	.	1	.	.	.	284	0.4
LIBERAL ARTS/ARTS/LETTERS	.	2	3	2	2	3	5	13	274	2	4	.	.	1	.	1	312	0.6
CHEMISTRY	3	2	.	4	2	3	11	19	258	1	1	3	1	3	.	1	312	1.4
GEOLOGY	.	1	.	.	1	2	3	4	270	.	.	.	1	.	.	1	283	0.1
MATHEMATICS	.	1	2	3	2	4	8	20	268	2	5	1	.	1	.	1	318	0.5
PHYSICS	.	2	2	1	2	3	11	10	265	1	2	1	.	2	.	1	303	0.6
RETAILING	1	1	2	2	1	.	1	6	266	2	.	.	.	2	.	.	284	0.8
SOCIAL SCIENCES	1	1	1	.	1	2	1	5	275	5	1	.	.	1	.	.	294	0.6

(Continued)

Continued. . .

Observations: Although the job market for college graduates is expected to increase by 1.4% for new bachelor's degree graduates this year, the demand for individual academic majors will vary significantly.

The greatest increase in demand will be experienced by electrical engineers (3.9%); computer science majors (3.8%); mechanical engineers (3.4%); industrial engineers (3.0%); accounting (2.7%); marketing/sales (2.7%); education (1.9%); hotel, restaurant, and institutional management (1.8%); chemical engineers (1.8%); general business administration (1.5%); metallurgy and materials science (1.5%); chemistry (1.4%); and civil engineers (1.3%).

Slight increases in demand are expected for: personnel administration (0.9%); retailing (0.8%); liberal arts/arts and letters (0.6%); physics (0.6%); social sciences (0.6%); financial administration (0.5%); mathematics (0.5%); telecommunication (0.4%); human ecology/home economics (0.4%); natural resources (0.3%); advertising (0.3%); communications (0.2%); journalism (0.2%); and geology (0.1%).

No change in the job market is expected for agriculture (0.0%).

From these data, it should be evident that a slight overall increase in the job market can be expected during 1985-86.

This year (1985-86), what change, if any, does your organization anticipate in the hiring of new college graduates? Responses are listed for anticipated change by EMPLOYER CATEGORY.

	ANTICIPATED CHANGE IN HIRING																		
	INC. 50+	INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 25-49	DEC. 50-100	TOT-AL	WEI-GHT-ED
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
.....EMPLOYER CATEGORIES																			
ACCOUNTING	2	1	2	1	.	1	.	1	8	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	18	16.6
AEROSPACE & COMPONENTS	2	.	.	1	.	1	1	.	8	1	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	16	8.8
AGRIBUSINESS	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	1	2	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	5	4.2
AUTOMOTIVE AND MECH EQUIPMENT	.	1	.	1	.	1	1	3	8	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	16	4.5
BANKING, FINANCE & INSURANCE	.	.	1	4	.	.	1	5	30	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	1	44	-0.6
CHEMICALS, DRUGS, ALLIED PROD	.	.	.	.	.	2	2	4	18	3	.	1	.	1	.	.	.	31	0.2
COMM (RADIO, TV, & NEWSPAPR)	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0.0
CONSTRUCTION & BUILDING MATLS	2	1	.	1	.	1	.	2	12	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	20	10.9
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS	4	.	1	2	1	7	11	18	44	1	.	1	.	1	1	.	1	93	4.6
ELECTR MACH & EQUIP (COMPTR)	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	13	.	1	.	.	.	.	2	.	17	-0.3
ELECTRONICS & INSTRUMENTS	.	1	2	1	.	.	.	2	19	1	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	28	2.8
FOOD, BEVERAGE PROC, & RESTR	3	2	1	2	.	2	1	1	13	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	26	17.5
GLASS, PKG, & ALLIED PRODUCTS	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	4	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	1	7	-11
GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	.	1	1	.	2	1	1	3	20	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	30	3.2
HOSPITALS & HEALTH SERVICES	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	.	3	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	5	1.6
HOTELS, MOTELS, RESORTS & REC	.	1	.	.	.	2	.	1	6	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	11	1.3
MERCHANDISING & RETAIL SERVS	.	1	4	1	1	2	.	2	17	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	30	5.0
METALS & METAL PRODUCTS	1	.	.	2	.	1	.	.	14	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	1	21	-3.5
MILITARY SERVICES	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	4	-1.0
PETROLEUM & ALLIED PRODUCTS	.	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	6	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	2	11	-17
PRINTING, PUBL & INFO SERVICES	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	1	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	7	1.4
PUBLIC UTILITIES INCL TRANSPO	2	.	.	3	.	1	.	5	33	5	.	1	.	1	1	3	1	56	-1.0
RESEARCH & CONSULTING SERVICES	1	.	1	.	.	1	1	1	19	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	3	29	-5.8
SERVICE & VOLUNTEER ORGANZATNS	.	1	.	.	.	.	1	.	3	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	5	10.8
TIRE & RUBBER PRODUCTS	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	1.0
DIVERSIFIED CONGLOMERATES	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	8	.	.	.	.	1	1	1	.	13	1.2

Continued. . .

Observations: Among different types of organizations, a diverse range of hiring trends are expected this year. According to employers responding to this survey, the greatest increases in hiring for bachelor's degree graduates will be in food, beverage processing and restaurants (19.0%); accounting (18.6%); construction and building materials (11.5%); service and volunteer organizations (10.8%).

Those organizations expecting moderate increases in the job market will include aerospace & components (8.8%); merchandising and retail services (5.1%); educational institutions (4.6%); automotive and mechanical equipment (4.5%); agribusiness (4.2%); governmental administration (3.2%); electronics and instruments (2.8%); hospitals and health services (1.6%); printing, publishing and informational services (1.4%); hotels, motels, resorts and recreational (1.3%); diversified conglomerates (1.2%); tire and rubber products (1.0%).

Expected to remain about the same or increase very slightly will be communication, radio, TV, and newspapers (0.0%); chemicals, drugs, allied products (0.2%).

Those organizations with declining job markets include electrical machinery and equipment-computers (-0.3%); banking, finance and insurance (-0.7%); military services (-1.0%); public utilities including transportation (-1.0%); metals and metal products (-4.2%); research and consulting services (-5.8%); glass, packaging, and allied products (-13.0%); petroleum and allied products (-17.0%).

What change, if any, do you anticipate in the number of INTERVIEW SCHEDULES arranged by your organization on college campuses this year (1985-86)?

CHANGE IN NO. OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULES																		
INC. 50+	INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 25-49	DEC. 50-100	TOT-AL	WEI-GHT-ED
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
26	8	17	37	11	37	33	36	207	14	9	8	2	18	16	29	8	516	2.6

Observations: According to employers responding to this survey, a very slight increase in numbers of interview schedules is expected on college campuses (+2.6%) this year. With hiring quotas increasing by 1.7% and campus interviewing schedules increasing 2.6%, it is evident that employers are emphasizing quality of new hires and just a few more hires when interviewing on college campuses this year.

What change, if any, do you anticipate in the number of INTERVIEW SCHEDULES arranged by your organization on college campuses this year (1985-86)? Responses are listed by EMPLOYER CATEGORY.

	CHANGE IN NO. OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULES																	TOTAL	WEIGHTED
	INC. 50+	INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 25-49	DEC. 50-100		
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
.....EMPLOYER CATEGORIES																			
ACCOUNTING	1	.	1	1	1	2	.	.	10	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	17	8.8
AEROSPACE & COMPONENTS	2	.	1	1	.	.	1	1	5	2	.	1	.	1	1	1	1	18	2.5
AGRIBUSINESS	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	3	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	5	3.8
AUTOMOTIVE AND MECH EQUIPMENT	.	.	.	1	.	1	.	3	3	1	.	.	.	2	.	2	.	13	-7.7
BANKING, FINANCE & INSURANCE	.	1	3	3	1	4	7	5	12	.	.	1	.	2	1	1	1	42	0.6
CHEMICALS, DRUGS, ALLIED PROD	.	.	.	3	.	1	.	2	11	1	1	1	1	4	3	2	.	30	-6.5
COMM (RADIO, TV, & NEWSPAPR)	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	2.0
CONSTRUCTION & BUILDING MATLS	3	.	.	.	.	2	3	1	4	1	.	.	.	.	2	1	.	17	13.0
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS	7	2	2	9	3	13	5	8	33	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	83	12.8
ELECTR MACH & EQUIP (COMPTR)	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	9	.	1	1	1	1	.	2	2	19	-16
ELECTRONICS & INSTRUMENTS	2	.	.	3	.	.	1	1	15	2	2	.	.	1	1	2	.	30	2.9
FOOD, BEVERAGE PROC, & RESTR	4	1	2	1	.	2	3	1	9	.	.	.	.	1	.	1	.	25	18.9
GLASS, PKG, & ALLIED PRODUCTS	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	3	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	6	-11
GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	1	.	.	3	.	3	2	1	15	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	27	5.6
HOSPITALS & HEALTH SERVICES	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	1	3	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	5	2.4
HOTELS, MOTELS, RESORTS & REC	.	2	.	.	1	1	2	.	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	11	6.5
MERCHANDISING & RETAIL SERVS	.	.	2	3	1	2	2	4	13	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	29	2.2
METALS & METAL PRODUCTS	2	.	.	.	1	.	.	1	8	1	.	.	.	1	.	3	1	18	-2.9
MILITARY SERVICES	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	4	0.0
PETROLEUM & ALLIED PRODUCTS	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	4	1	.	.	.	.	1	4	2	13	-31
PRINTING, PUBL & INFO SERVICES	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	3.3
PUBLIC UTILITIES INCL TRANSPO	1	.	2	5	2	.	3	4	18	.	1	2	.	3	1	4	.	46	-0.8
RESEARCH & CONSULTING SERVICES	2	.	1	.	.	4	3	1	12	1	1	.	.	.	2	.	.	27	7.6
SERVICE & VOLUNTEER ORGANZATNS	1	1	1	1	.	.	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	6	31.3
TIRE & RUBBER PRODUCTS	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	-2.0
DIVERSIFIED CONGLOMERATES	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	1	1	.	.	2	3	1	1	13	-15

Continued. . .

Observations: Again this year, changes in numbers of interview schedules will vary according to type of organization. According to the surveyed employers, the greatest increases in interview schedules can be expected from the following organizations: service and volunteer organizations (+31.3%); food, beverage processing, and restaurants (+18.9%); construction and building materials manufacturers (+13.0%); and educational institutions (+12.8%).

Moderate increases can be expected from accounting (+8.8%); research and consulting services (+7.6%); hotels, motels, resorts and recreational facilities (+6.5%); governmental administration (+5.6%); agribusiness (+3.8%); printing, publishing, and information services (+3.3%); electronics and instruments (+2.9%); aerospace and components (+2.5%); hospitals and health services (+2.4%); merchandising and retail services (+2.2%); communication, radio, TV, and newspapers (+2.0%); and banking, finance and insurance (+0.6%).

No change in numbers of campus interview schedules is expected for military organizations (0.0%).

Those organizations expecting declines in interview schedules will include the following: public utilities including transportation (-0.8%); tire and rubber products (-2.0%); metals and metal products (-2.9%); automotive and mechanical equipment (-7.7%); chemicals, drugs, and allied products (-6.5%); glass, paper, packaging, and allied products (-11.0%); diversified conglomerates (-15.0%); electrical machinery and equipment (-16.0%); and petroleum and allied products (-31.0%);

Of those organizations surveyed this year, 72 do not expect to interview on any college campuses.

What change, if any, do you anticipate in the number of CAMPUS VISITS for recruiting by your organization this year (1985-86)?

CHANGE IN NO. OF CAMPUS VISITS																		
INC. 50+	INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 25-49	DEC. 50-100	TOT-AL	WEI-GHT-ED
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
28	12	18	40	8	45	33	32	218	13	11	8	5	14	19	22	14	540	2.8

Observations: Employers are expecting to conduct approximately 2.8% more campus visits this year, according to those surveyed. However, 78 organizations do not expect to visit any college campuses.

What percentage change, if any, does your organization anticipate in salary offers to 1985-86 college graduates by academic major and degree level? Listed below are anticipated changes in salary offers for various TYPES OF GRADUATES.

	ANTICIPATED CHANGES IN SALARY OFFERS														BACHELORS GRADUATES	WEIGHTED
	INC. OVER 10%	INC. 9-10%	INC. 7-8%	INC. 5-6%	INC. 3-4%	INC. 1-2%	SAME	DEC. 1-2%	DEC. 3-4%	DEC. 5-6%	DEC. 7-8%	DEC. 9-10%	DEC. OVER 10%	NONE HIRED		
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
BACHELORS GRADUATES	68	61	190	664	1024	718	4044	110	67	82	7	2	21	1968	9026	1.8

Observations: According to employers responding to this survey, starting salary offers will increase by an average of 1.8% for bachelor's degree graduates.

	ANTICIPATED CHANGES IN SALARY OFFERS													TOTAL	WEIGHTED
	INC. OVER 10%	INC. 9-10%	INC. 7-8%	INC. 5-6%	INC. 3-4%	INC. 1-2%	SAME	DEC. 1-2%	DEC. 3-4%	DEC. 5-6%	DEC. 7-8%	DEC. OVER 10%	NONE HIRED		
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
.....TYPES OF GRADUATES															
WOMEN GRADUATES	5	14	22	106	112	61	140	5	7	4	1	1	6	484	3.1
MINORITY GRADUATES	9	12	21	107	108	58	130	6	7	4	1	1	6	470	3.2
MBA/MS GRADUATES	3	4	18	57	75	42	136	5	3	3	.	2	40	388	2.7
DOCTORAL GRADUATES	1	1	10	37	54	22	148	5	2	4	.	.	65	349	2.2

Observations: According to surveyed employers, starting salary offers for women and minorities will increase by an average of 3.1% and 3.2%, respectively. At the MBA/master's level, increases of 2.7% are anticipated, and for doctoral degree graduates, 2.2%.

(Continued)

What percentage change, if any, does your organization anticipate in salary offers to 1985-86 college graduates by academic major and degree level? Listed below are changes in salary offers for bachelor's degree graduates expected by various EMPLOYER CATEGORIES.

	ANTICIPATED CHANGES IN SALARY OFFERS													TOT-AL	WEI-GHT-ED
	INC. OVER 10%	INC. 9-10%	INC. 7-8%	INC. 5-6%	INC. 3-4%	INC. 1-2%	SAME	DEC. 1-2%	DEC. 3-4%	DEC. 5-6%	DEC. 7-8%	DEC. OVER 10%	NONE HIR-ED		
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
.....EMPLOYER CATEGORIES															
ACCOUNTING	.	.	1	8	4	.	2	.	.	.	1	.	.	16	4.0
AEROSPACE	1	.	2	2	6	2	2	1	.	.	.	.	.	16	4.1
AGRIBUSINESS	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	3	1.3
AUTOMOTIVE	.	1	.	1	5	5	3	.	.	.	.	.	.	15	3.1
BANKING FIN	.	2	1	9	7	6	15	2	1	.	.	.	.	43	2.7
CHEMICALS	.	.	.	6	8	7	7	1	1	1	.	.	.	31	2.3
COMMUNICATION	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0.0
CONSTRUCTION	.	.	.	5	4	4	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	17	3.2
EDUCATION	1	1	9	38	12	5	11	.	1	2	.	1	1	82	4.3
ELECTR MACH	.	.	1	2	2	1	7	.	.	.	.	1	.	14	1.3
ELECTRONICS	.	.	.	6	6	3	12	1	.	.	.	.	2	30	2.3
RESTAURANTS	1	.	2	7	4	3	7	1	.	.	.	.	.	25	3.6
PACKAGING	.	.	.	1	3	.	.	.	.	2	.	.	.	6	1.0
GOVERNMENT	.	.	.	6	9	4	12	.	.	.	.	.	.	31	2.6
HOSPITALS	.	.	.	1	2	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	5	2.8
HOTELS MOTELS	.	2	.	2	2	3	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	11	4.2
MERCHANDISING	3	2	2	4	4	4	6	1	.	.	.	.	.	26	4.5
METALS PRODS	.	.	.	4	5	.	7	.	.	.	.	1	.	17	1.9
MILITARY	.	.	.	1	2	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	4	4.0
PETROLEUM	.	.	1	.	4	.	6	.	.	.	.	.	.	11	2.2
PRINTING PUBL	.	.	.	.	2	1	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	7	1.4
UTILITIES	.	.	1	9	20	7	10	.	2	1	.	.	.	50	2.8
RESEARCH	1	.	2	4	8	2	8	.	.	.	.	.	.	25	3.5
SERV VOL ORGS	.	.	.	2	1	2	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	7	2.9
TIRE RUBBER	.	.	.	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	4.0
CONGLOMERATES	1	.	1	2	4	1	3	.	1	.	.	.	.	13	3.5

(Continued) ...

Continued . . .

Observations: Several employer categories are expecting to offer starting salary increases of 4.0% or greater to the 1985-86 graduating class. These include: merchandising and related services (retailing industries) (+4.5%); educational institution (+4.3%); hotels, motels, resorts, camps, recreational facilities (+4.2%); aerospace and components (+4.1%); accounting (+4.0%); military (+4.0%); and tire and rubber products (+4.0%).

Starting salary increases in the range of 3.0% to 3.9% include: restaurants (+3.6%); diversified conglomerates (+3.5%); research and/or consulting services (+3.5%); construction and building materials manufacturing (+3.2%); and automotive and mechanical equipment (+3.1%).

Increases of 2.0% to 2.9% are anticipated from: service or volunteer organizations (+2.9%); public utilities (including transportation) (+2.8%); hospitals and health services (+2.8%); banking finance and insurance (+2.7%); governmental administration (+2.6%); electronics and instruments (+2.3%); chemical, drugs and allied products (+2.3%); and petroleum and allied products (+2.2%).

Increases of 1.9% or less are expected from: metals and metal products (+1.9%); printing, publishing and informational services (+1.4%); electrical machinery and equipment (computers) (+1.3%); agribusiness (+1.3%); packaging, glass and allied products (+1.0%); and communication-radio, television, and newspapers (0.0%).

What percentage change, if any, does your organization anticipate in salary offers to 1985-86 college graduates by academic major and degree level? Listed below are anticipated changes in salary offers to bachelor's degree graduates with various ACADEMIC MAJORS.

	ANTICIPATED CHANGES IN SALARY OFFERS														
	INC. OVER 10%	INC. 9-10%	INC. 7-8%	INC. 5-6%	INC. 3-4%	INC. 1-2%	SAME	DEC. 1-2%	DEC. 3-4%	DEC. 5-6%	DEC. 7-8%	DEC. 9-10%	DEC. OVER 10%	NONE HIRED	TOTAL	WEIGHTED
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
.....ACADEMIC MAJORS																
AGRICULTURE	2	1	2	12	17	16	154	3	1	3	.	.	2	83	296	0.8
NATURAL RESOURCES	2	.	3	9	16	13	150	3	1	2	.	1	.	85	285	0.7
ACCOUNTING	3	3	7	56	67	44	137	6	6	7	1	.	1	37	375	2.1
FINANCIAL ADMIN	2	4	2	37	42	32	135	3	3	5	.	.	2	51	318	1.8
GEN BUS ADMIN	3	5	5	41	47	38	138	6	2	5	.	.	2	44	336	1.9
HOTEL REST INST MGT	2	4	3	11	21	17	134	3	1	3	.	.	.	90	289	1.4
MARKETING/SALES	5	5	6	33	47	42	129	4	5	4	1	.	2	52	335	2.1
PERSONNEL	4	2	4	26	31	32	153	5	2	3	.	.	1	57	320	1.6
ADVERTISING	1	1	2	14	18	18	151	3	1	2	.	.	1	78	290	1.3
COMMUNICATIONS	1	2	2	13	25	21	151	3	1	2	.	.	.	73	294	1.4
JOURNALISM	1	1	2	11	23	18	149	4	1	2	.	.	.	82	294	1.4
TELECOMMUNICATION	1	.	2	11	23	21	143	3	1	2	.	.	.	79	286	1.4
EDUCATION	1	2	9	41	30	17	147	4	3	3	.	.	1	79	337	2.0
CHEMICAL ENGR	4	1	8	26	55	27	134	5	1	3	.	1	1	62	328	2.0
CIVIL ENGR	1	1	4	21	40	26	139	6	2	2	.	.	.	76	318	1.8
COMPUTER SCIENCE	4	3	14	57	69	39	126	4	4	3	1	.	2	44	370	2.6
ELECTRICAL ENGR	4	4	13	45	68	42	130	3	5	4	.	.	1	53	372	2.5
INDUSTRIAL ENGR	4	3	6	23	44	31	133	4	2	4	.	.	1	68	323	2.0
MECHANICAL ENGR	4	4	13	41	76	44	125	4	3	4	.	.	3	59	380	2.3
METALLURGY MATERIALS SCIENCE	3	.	5	17	33	18	137	4	3	2	.	.	1	79	302	1.6
HUMAN ECOL/HOME ECONOMICS	3	1	4	9	16	16	150	3	1	2	1	.	.	82	288	1.4
LIBERAL ARTS/ARTS/LETTERS	2	5	4	17	39	24	143	5	2	2	1	.	.	65	309	1.8
CHEMISTRY	2	1	7	17	38	22	140	4	1	3	.	.	.	73	308	1.8
GEOLOGY	2	.	5	12	22	12	148	3	1	2	.	.	.	80	287	1.5
MATHEMATICS	1	1	10	24	36	24	139	4	2	3	.	.	.	66	310	1.9
PHYSICS	1	1	8	16	35	20	142	3	1	2	.	.	.	72	301	1.8
RETAILING	3	3	4	9	16	18	144	4	1	2	1	.	.	85	290	1.6
SOCIAL SCIENCES	2	3	6	13	20	19	154	4	1	1	1	.	.	75	299	1.6

(Continued)

Continued . . .

Observations: Starting salary offers for new bachelor's degree graduates are not expected to increase this year (1985-86) as much as they did last year. Highest anticipated increases for graduates this year are expected for computer science majors (2.6%), electrical engineers (2.5%), mechanical engineers (2.3%), accounting (2.1%), marketing/sales (2.1%), education (2.0%), chemical engineers (2.0%), and industrial engineers (2.0%).

Those majors with anticipated increases in the moderate range are: general business administration (1.9%); mathematics (1.9%); financial administration (1.8%); civil engineering (1.8%); liberal arts/arts & letters (1.8%); chemistry (1.8%); physics (1.8%); personnel (1.6%); metallurgy and materials science (1.6%); retailing (1.6%); social sciences (1.6%); geology (1.5%); hotel, restaurant, and institutional management (1.4%); communications (1.4%); journalism (1.4%); telcommunication (1.4%); human ecology/home economics (1.4%); and advertising (1.3%).

Expected to increase less than 1.0% are: agriculture (0.8%) and natural resources (0.7%).

ACADEMIC MAJORS, ESTIMATED PERCENT CHANGE AND ESTIMATED STARTING SALARIES 1985-86

Academic Majors Bachelor's Degrees	Estimated % Change	Estimated Starting Salary 1985-86
Electrical Engineering	2.5%	$ 29,187
Mechanical Engineering	2.3%	28,971
Chemical Engineering	2.0%	28,739
Computer Science	2.6%	27,775
Industrial Engineering	2.0%	26,817
Civil Engineering	1.8%	24,761
Physics	1.8%	24,370
Financial Administration	1.8%	20,803
Accounting	2.1%	20,338
Chemistry	1.8%	19,679
General Business Administration	1.9%	19,589
Marketing/Sales	2.1%	19,284
Mathematics	1.9%	19,014
Social Science	1.6%	18,324
Communications	1.4%	17,923
Agriculture	0.8%	17,841
Advertising	1.3%	17,832
Personnel Administration	1.6%	17,727
Telecommunication	1.4%	17,473
Hotel, Rest, Inst. Mgmt	1.4%	17,375
Liberal Arts/Arts and Letters	1.8%	17,358
Geology	1.5%	17,185
Education	2.0%	16,903
Journalism	1.4%	16,207
Human Ecology/Home Economics	1.4%	15,635
Natural Resources	0.7%	15,709
Retailing	1.6%	15,898
Average for Different Degree Levels		
Bachelor's	1.8%	21,601
Master's	2.7%	26,010
PhD	2.2%	30,011

*Source for base starting salaries when preparing this chart: John D. Shingleton and Edwin B. Fitzpatrick, ANNUAL SALARY REPORT---1984-85. East Lansing, Michigan: Placement Services, Michigan State University, 1985.

Observations: Again this year, the highest starting salaries are expected for electrical engineers, ($29,187), mechanical engineers ($28,971), chemical engineers ($28,739), computer science majors ($27,775), and industrial engineers ($26,817). Estimated starting salaries for other academic majors are listed above.

When calculating starting salary offers, does your organization provide extra compensation for the following factors?

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
WHEN CALCULATING STARTING SALARY													
HIGH GRADE POINT AVERAGES	45	7	74	12	129	21	92	15	261	43	601	100	3.7
PREVIOUS PART-TIME WORK EXPERIENCES	59	10	120	20	204	34	84	14	136	23	603	100	3.2
PRIOR MILITARY EXPERIENCES	50	8	36	6	140	24	131	22	237	40	594	100	3.8
QUALITY OF COLLEGE GRANTING DEGREE	30	5	64	11	137	23	96	16	271	45	598	100	3.9
HIGH DEMAND ACADEMIC MAJOR	36	6	127	21	206	35	71	12	157	26	597	100	3.3

Observations: According to employers responding to the survey, previous part-time work experiences and high demand academic majors "sometimes" influence their decisions when calculating starting salary offers. Sometimes considered are high grade point averages, prior military experiences, and quality of the college granting an individual's degree.

In your opinion, should entry-level candidates state career objectives on their resumes?

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
SHOULD CAREER OBJECTIVES BE STATED ON													
RESUMES OF NEW GRADUATES	276	45	188	31	102	17	28	5	17	3	611	100	1.9

Observations: The surveyed employers suggested that entry-level candidates should generally state career objectives on their resumes. About 92% of the employers agreed with this recommendation.

Based upon your experiences, what will be the availability of employment opportunities during 1985-86 for new college graduates in each geographical region of the United States?

	LEVELS OF JOB AVAILABILITY												
	EXTREMELY HIGH		HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		NO		TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS													
NORTHEAST (ME,MA,CT,NY,RI,ETC)	9	2	81	17	241	51	109	23	35	7	475	100	3.2
SOUTHEAST (FL,GA,VA,NC,SC,ETC)	22	5	140	30	203	43	73	16	32	7	470	100	2.9
NORTHCENTRAL (MI,IL,OH,WI,ETC)	12	2	53	10	249	49	173	34	24	5	511	100	3.3
SOUTHCENTRAL (TX,OK,MO,KS,ETC)	20	4	116	25	216	46	85	18	31	7	468	100	3.0
NORTHWEST (AK,WA,OR,MT,ID,ETC)	4	1	42	9	187	41	172	37	56	12	461	100	3.5
SOUTHWEST (CA,NV,HI,NM,AZ,ETC)	27	6	180	38	171	36	62	13	35	7	475	100	2.8

Observations: The greatest availability of jobs for new college graduates during 1985-86 will be in the southwestern region of the United States, according to employers responding to this survey. The southeastern and southcentral regions were considered next best on the employers' list of best geographical areas for jobs. For the last two years, these regions were rated near this same order.

The best geographical regions for jobs in order of availability are: southwest, southeast, southcentral, northeast, northcentral, and northwest, according to the surveyed employers.

What percent of new college graduates hired last year (1984-85) by your organization were from the following sources?

	PERCENTAGE OF NEW COLLEGE HIRES															TOTAL	WEIGHTED
	0%	1-2%	3-4%	5-6%	7-8%	9-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%		
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
SOURCES OF NEW COLLEGE GRADUATES																	
ON-CAMPUS INTERVIEWING	97	22	8	17	5	28	27	34	28	50	38	61	61	51	46	573	45.9
JOB LISTINGS WITH PLACEMENT OFFICE	194	103	39	32	12	37	17	10	7	19	2	2	6	4	10	494	10.1
UNSOLICITED REFERRALS FROM PLACMNT	299	84	32	24	5	14	6	2	2	4	.	1	.	1	.	474	2.6
REFERRALS FROM CAMPUS ORGANIZATIONS	340	70	27	12	4	8	4	3	2	1	1	.	.	.	.	472	1.7
JOB LISTINGS WITH EMPLYMNT AGENCIES	359	49	17	15	5	11	10	4	2	3	.	.	1	.	1	477	2.4
COLLEGE FACULTY/STAFF REFERRALS	227	121	45	33	12	31	5	3	2	3	.	1	1	.	2	486	3.7
CURRENT EMPLOYEE REFERRALS	134	110	57	52	17	53	41	21	9	10	1	.	1	1	3	510	8.4
MINORITY CAREER PROGRAMS	304	89	28	26	8	12	2	2	2	2	.	.	2	.	.	477	2.2
WOMENS CAREER PROGRAMS	369	50	22	12	3	3	.	.	2	1	.	.	1	.	.	463	1.1
HIGH DEMAND MAJOR PROGRAMS	342	21	19	18	1	13	7	4	3	4	4	1	1	3	4	445	4.5
COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS	280	76	27	29	7	26	14	6	2	2	1	5	.	.	2	477	4.2
SUMMER EMPLOYMENT	253	82	39	40	13	21	10	4	3	3	1	2	2	.	1	474	4.1
PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT	276	87	33	25	4	16	10	4	4	3	.	2	.	.	1	465	3.3
INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS	266	80	31	30	9	22	17	11	2	2	.	1	.	.	4	475	4.4
WALK-INS	212	75	42	54	7	37	27	9	12	9	.	3	3	1	1	492	7.0
WRITE-INS	119	79	54	64	10	65	62	28	19	11	5	3	1	3	3	526	11.5
RESPONSES FROM WANT ADS	214	76	26	33	10	41	34	17	9	13	3	1	5	1	13	496	10.5

(Continued)...

Continued . . .

Observations: When prospective employers are seeking new college graduates, certain sources are more productive than others, according to surveyed employers. For both graduating students planning their job campaigns and employers wanting to hire new graduates, this knowledge can be helpful.

Employers reported that 45.9% of their new hires were obtained from on-campus interviewing, 11.5% from write-ins, 10.5% from want ads, 10.1% from job listings sent to placement offices, 8.4% from current employee referrals, and 7.0% from walk-ins.

Percentages obtained from other sources include: high demand academic major programs (4.5%), internship programs (4.4%), cooperative education programs (4.2%), summer employment programs (4.1%), referrals from college faculty and staff (3.7%), part-time employment programs (3.3%), unsolicited referrals from placement offices (2.6%), minority career programs (2.2%), job listings with employment agencies (2.4%), referrals from campus organizations (1.7%), and women's career programs (1.1%).

What percent of your new hires last year (1984-85) had the following grade point averages (on a 4.0 system).

	PERCENTAGE OF NEW PROFESSIONAL HIRES															TOT-AL	WEI-GHT-ED
	0%	1-2%	3-4%	5-6%	7-8%	9-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%		
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
GRADE POINT AVERAGES																	
3.76-4.00	69	72	47	49	14	62	49	25	5	14	3	5	6	3	4	427	13.3
3.51-3.75	50	39	41	36	28	63	74	49	25	27	5	2	5	6	5	455	18.7
3.26-3.50	30	23	16	30	14	64	91	77	45	33	11	7	4	3	4	452	23.8
3.01-3.25	38	24	13	16	6	49	80	74	48	44	22	10	6	6	12	448	28.8
2.76-3.00	63	39	18	23	11	62	75	45	33	30	14	3	6	5	5	432	21.2
2.51-2.75	114	46	30	31	19	55	33	23	10	6	2	1	2	1	3	376	10.3
2.26-2.50	199	44	26	31	9	17	8	6	2	2	.	.	.	.	.	344	3.3
2.01-2.25	266	36	13	8	2	7	1	2	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	338	1.2
2.00 OR BELOW	318	10	3	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	333	0.1

Observations: Employers responding to this survey indicated that over 70% of their new hires had grade point averages of 3.0 or better. Other employers, however, reported that their new hires had grade point averages of less than 3.0.

In recent years, it seems, the grade point average has become the measuring stick for success in college. Data from this report may also tell us that most graduating students with high grade point averages are hired by prospective employers who conduct campus interviews.

When considering new college graduates for employment in your organization, how important are each of the following?

	LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOTAL
	EXTREMELY HIGH		HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		NO IMPORTANCE				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
FACTORS CONSIDERED IN NEW GRADUATES													
STAYING POWER AND STABILITY	160	24	318	48	146	22	31	5	7	1	662	100	2.[illegible]
BUDGETING ABILITIES	15	2	73	11	213	33	224	35	114	18	639	100	3.5
TEAM MANAGEMENT SKILLS	84	13	269	42	203	31	65	10	27	4	648	100	2.5
SELF-PRIDE	96	15	377	58	154	24	13	2	8	1	648	100	2.2
INTEREST IN FAMILY LIFE	16	2	104	16	215	33	150	23	173	26	658	100	3.5
NEATNESS	67	10	297	46	235	36	39	6	14	2	652	100	2.4
PHYSICAL FITNESS	17	3	160	24	306	46	117	18	59	9	659	100	3.1
GOOD LOOKS AND YOUTHFULNESS	11	2	49	8	221	34	193	30	176	27	650	100	3.7
SPEAKING ABILITIES	160	24	367	56	115	18	11	2	3	0	656	100	2.0
ORGAN ABILITIES WHEN SPEAKING	139	21	360	55	127	19	22	3	6	1	654	100	2.1
ENTREPRENEURIAL SPIRIT	53	8	162	25	227	35	131	20	68	11	641	100	3.0
ABILITY TO GO ALONG WITH ORG.	53	8	204	31	302	46	85	13	14	2	658	100	2.7
MATURITY	197	30	382	58	75	11	2	0	1	0	657	100	1.8
ABILITY TO ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY	299	45	315	48	40	6	2	0	2	0	658	100	1.6
ABILITY TO WORK IN CLOSE QUARTERS	28	4	97	15	225	35	181	28	120	18	651	100	3.4
ABILITY TO DEPEND ON PEOPLE	24	4	131	20	294	45	160	25	44	7	653	100	3.1
TACTICAL AND STRATEGIC PLANNING	48	7	188	29	272	41	122	19	27	4	657	100	2.8
AN EXAMPLE FOR OTHERS	95	14	250	38	229	35	70	11	16	2	660	100	2.5
COMPETITIVE ABILITIES	55	8	256	39	256	39	77	12	10	2	654	100	2.6
COMMUNICATION ABILITIES	319	48	300	45	42	6	1	0	.	.	662	100	1.6
MOTIVATIONAL ABILITIES	250	38	309	47	85	13	8	1	2	0	654	100	1.8
PERSEVERANCE	182	28	355	54	107	16	9	1	5	1	658	100	1.9

(Continued) ....

Continued . . .

Observations: When considering new college graduates for employment in their organizations, surveyed employers believe that the most important factors include ability to accept responsibility, communication abilities, maturity, motivational abilities, perseverance, speaking abilities, staying power and stability, organizational abilities when speaking, self-pride, and neatness.

Receiving ratings of "medium" importance (2.5 to 3.4) were team management skills , an example for others, competitive abilities, ability to go along with the organization, tactical and strategic planning skills, entrepreneurial spirit, physical fitness, ability to depend on other people, and the ability to work in close quarters.

Ratings of "low" importance (3.5 to 4.4) were given to budgeting abilities , interest in family life, and good looks and youthfulness.

When screening applicants for employment in your organization, which of the following methods are used?

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
.....SCREENING METHODS USED													
ABILITY/APTITUDE TESTS	64	10	29	4	109	16	119	18	344	52	665	100	4.0
JOB TRYOUTS	9	1	12	2	83	13	158	24	397	60	659	100	4.4
ASSESSMENT CENTER ANALYSES	6	1	15	2	55	9	86	13	480	75	642	100	4.6
COMPREHENSIVE BIO-INVENTORIES	11	2	14	2	24	4	65	10	511	82	625	100	4.7
REFERENCE CHECKS	300	45	153	23	155	23	52	8	12	2	672	100	2.0
TRANSCRIPT CHECKS	284	42	158	24	146	22	59	9	25	4	672	100	2.1
GRADE POINT AVERAGES	215	32	209	31	188	28	41	6	13	2	666	100	2.1
RESUMES/SUMMARIES OF WORK EXPERIENCES	470	70	158	23	40	6	4	1	1	0	673	100	1.4
INTERVIEWS	621	92	48	7	6	1	1	0	.	.	676	100	1.1
RATINGS FROM TRAINING PROGRAMS	63	10	81	12	182	28	137	21	189	29	652	100	3.5
YEARS OF EDUCATION	281	42	180	27	169	25	20	3	16	2	666	100	2.0
DEGREE LEVELS ATTAINED	309	47	175	26	154	23	18	3	6	1	662	100	1.8
PRE-EMPLOYMENT SCREENING FOR DRUGS	60	9	16	2	32	5	80	12	473	72	661	100	4.3
PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS	286	43	22	3	56	8	73	11	227	34	664	100	2.9
BLOOD TESTS	143	22	14	2	38	6	70	11	379	59	644	100	3.8
MEDICAL HISTORY	234	35	31	5	73	11	78	12	244	37	660	100	3.1
INTERVIEWS W/ CO. DOCTORS/NURSES	140	22	13	2	52	8	72	11	374	57	651	100	3.8

Observations: When screening applicants for employment in their organizations, the surveyed employers indicated that personal interviews and resumes or summaries of work experiences were "always" required.

Methods used "almost always" were degree levels attained, reference checks, years of education, transcript checks, and grade point averages.

Used "sometimes" were physical examinations and medical histories. "Seldom" used were ratings from training programs, blood tests, interviews with company doctors or nurses, ability and/or aptitude tests, pre-employment screening for drugs, and job tryouts.

The surveyed employers "never" use assessment center analyses or comprehensive bio-inventories.

Before graduating students are hired by your organization, which of the following references are checked?

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
WHICH REFERENCES ARE CHECKED?													
FACULTY	91	13	108	16	286	42	141	21	53	8	679	100	2.9
PAST EMPLOYERS	277	41	179	26	141	21	68	10	18	3	683	100	2.1
PERSONAL REFERENCES	94	14	99	15	203	31	172	26	97	15	665	100	3.1
FORMER SUPERVISORS	179	27	198	29	198	29	69	10	31	5	675	100	2.4
BUSINESS ASSOCIATES	38	6	60	9	269	40	195	29	106	16	668	100	3.4
CLERGY	1	0	5	1	56	8	215	32	393	59	670	100	4.5

Observations: Before graduating students are hired by most organizations, references from past employers and former supvervisors are "almost always" checked, according to surveyed employers, "Sometimes" checked are references from faculty members, personal references, and those from business associates. "Never" checked are references from clergy.

If your organization checks references. which of the following methods are used?

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
METHODS USED TO CHECK REFERENCES													
VERBALLY/PHONE	189	29	256	40	169	26	25	4	9	1	648	100	2.1
WRITTEN INQUIRIES/LETTER	104	16	127	20	247	38	106	16	63	10	647	100	2.8
PERSONAL VISIT	3	0	9	1	57	9	166	26	401	63	636	100	4.5
CREDIT BUREAU CHECKS	41	7	17	3	58	9	99	16	415	66	630	100	4.3
POLICE RECORD CHECKS	78	13	15	2	91	15	129	21	295	49	608	100	3.9

Observations: References are "almost always" checked by making telephone calls. "Sometimes" used as reference checks are written inquiries and letters. "Seldom" used are police record checks or credit bureau checks. "Never" used are personal visits to references.

Of the surveyed employers, 24 indicated that their organizations do not check any references before hiring new college graduates.

In your opinion, is it advantageous for candidates to list references on the resume?

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE												
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER		TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
SHOULD REFERENCES BE LISTED?													
IS IT ADVANTAGEOUS	174	26	132	19	182	27	126	19	66	10	680	100	2.7

Observations: In the opinion of employers, candidates should usually list references on their resumes. Of those employers surveyed, 72% indicated that references should "always" or "almost always" or "sometimes" be listed. Only 29% of the surveyed employers indicated that references should "never" be listed.

How would you describe today's college student?

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOTAL
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
DESCRIBE COLLEGE STUDENTS TODAY													
SELF CONCERNED AND ME-ORIENTED	7	1	169	25	409	61	81	12	1	0	667	100	2.9
IDEALISTIC	8	1	183	28	412	63	53	8	2	0	658	100	2.8
DISENCHANTED WITH POLITICS	5	1	62	10	393	62	162	26	13	2	635	100	3.2
MODERATE IN POLITICAL ATTITUDES	3	0	214	33	369	57	53	8	3	0	642	100	2.7
LIBERAL IN SOCIAL ATTITUDES	7	1	175	27	395	61	66	10	1	0	644	100	2.8
WEAK IN BASIC SKILLS	1	0	59	9	397	60	198	30	7	1	662	100	3.2
CAREER-ORIENTED	56	8	475	72	123	19	9	1	.	.	663	100	2.1
COMPETITIVE	27	4	396	60	230	35	8	1	.	.	661	100	2.3
DIVERSE IN LIFESTYLES AND BACKGROUND	64	10	313	48	243	37	35	5	1	0	656	100	2.4
CONCERNED WITH PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT	15	2	285	44	318	49	35	5	1	0	654	100	2.6
OPTIMISTIC ABOUT INDIVIDUAL FUTURE	38	6	479	73	134	20	4	1	.	.	655	100	2.2
PESSIMISTIC ABOUT FUTURE OF COUNTRY	.	.	19	3	275	43	315	49	31	5	640	100	3.6
INTERESTED IN MATERIAL SUCCESS	50	8	399	61	190	29	18	3	1	0	658	100	2.3
FRIENDLY AND PLEASANT	43	6	513	77	105	16	2	0	.	.	663	100	2.1
PRAGMATIC	9	1	202	31	389	60	43	7	1	0	644	100	2.7

Observations: When describing today's college students, employers say that they are "almost always" career-oriented, friendly and pleasant, optimistic about their future, interested in material success, competitive and diverse in their lifestyles and backgrounds.

College students are "sometimes" concerned with personal development, moderate in political attitudes, pragmatic, idealistic, liberal in social attitudes, self-concerned and me-oriented, disenchanted with politics, and weak in basic skills.

"Seldom" are college students pessimistic about the future of their country.

Does your organization pre-screen at colleges and universities where pre-screening is permitted?

	FREQUENCY	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RESPONSE	32	.	.	.
YES	458	458	67.552	67.552
NO	220	678	32.448	100.000

Observations: Of the surveyed employers, 67.6% indicated that their organizations will pre-screen on college campuses where pre-screening is permitted. Last year, 69.2% of the surveyed employers expected to pre-screen. This slight decrease in percentage is statistically insignificant, so continuing attention will be given to pre-screening on college campuses this year.

When pre-screening candidates for initial campus interviews with your organization, how important are each of the following?

	LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	EXTREMELY HIGH		HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		NO IMPORTANCE				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
FACTORS CONSIDERED WHEN PRESCREENING													
ACADEMIC MAJOR	360	68	140	26	19	4	6	1	8	2	533	100	1.4
DEGREE LEVELS	173	33	224	42	98	19	25	5	9	2	529	100	2.0
STATED CAREER GOALS	45	9	255	48	181	34	39	7	8	2	528	100	2.5
OVERALL GRADE POINT AVERAGE	92	17	243	46	173	32	17	3	9	2	534	100	2.3
MAJOR GRADE POINT AVERAGE	98	19	270	52	133	25	13	2	10	2	524	100	2.2
COLLEGE ORGANIZATIONS & ACTIVITIES	51	9	190	35	226	42	57	11	15	3	539	100	2.6
PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCES	114	22	258	49	126	24	21	4	11	2	530	100	2.2
LOCATIONAL PREFERENCES	120	22	223	41	137	25	39	7	19	4	538	100	2.3
EXPECTED DATE OF GRADUATION	133	25	234	45	112	21	29	6	15	3	523	100	2.2
MILITARY EXPERIENCES	9	2	32	6	139	26	198	37	160	30	538	100	3.9

Observations: Those factors considered most important to prospective employers when pre-screening candidates for initial campus interviews (those receiving ratings of "extremely high" or "high" importance) were academic majors, degree levels, major grade point averages, previous work experiences, expected dates of graduation, overall grade point averages, and locational preferences.

Next on employers' lists of important factors (those with ratings of "medium" importance) were stated career goals, college organizations, and campus activities.

A rating of "low" importance was given to military experiences.

Did your organization request any closed schedules when interviewing on college campuses last year?

	FREQUENCY	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RESPONSE	52	.	.	.
YES	235	235	35.714	35.714
NO	423	658	64.286	100.000

Observations: Of the employers surveyed, 35.7% indicated that closed schedules were requested on college campuses last year. This compares to 36.9% who requested closed schedules in 1983-84, a slight decrease, but not statistically significant.

What change, if any, do you foresee in the number of closed schedules arranged by your organization on college campuses this year (1985-86)?

CHANGE IN NO. OF CLOSED SCHEDULES															
INC. 50+	INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 25-49	DEC. 50-100	TOTAL	WEIGHTED
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
11	8	12	20	7	17	10	14	479	3	5	1	2	10	599	1.7

Observations: During 1985-86, the surveyed employers expect to arrange about 1.7% more closed schedules. This increase is somewhat smaller than last year's increase of 4.7% more than 1983-84.

At colleges and universities where closed schedules are not permitted, what change, if any, do you foresee in numbers of interview schedules held by your organization on these campuses?

CHANGE IN NO. OF SCHEDULES																	
INC. 50+	INC. 25-49	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 25-49	DEC. 50-100	TOTAL	WEIGHTED
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
1	2	3	1	3	5	7	509	8	3	8	1	12	5	5	16	589	-3.2

Observations: At colleges and universities where closed schedules are not permitted, surveyed employers expect to reduce their interviewing schedules by about 3.2%. In the words of surveyed employers, they will visit campuses where they receive the services they desire.

What percentage of new college graduates interviewed by your organization on campuses last year (1984-85) were hired?

```
      FREQUENCY  CUM FREQ   PERCENT  CUM PERCENT

 .        108        .          .          .
 0         96       96     15.947     15.947
 1         22      118      3.654     19.601
 2         15      133      2.492     22.093
 3         13      146      2.159     24.252
 4         23      169      3.821     28.073
 5         68      237     11.296     39.369
 6         17      254      2.824     42.193
 7         19      273      3.156     45.349
 8         22      295      3.654     49.003
 9          8      303      1.329     50.332
10         89      392     14.784     65.116
11          6      398      0.997     66.113
12         12      410      1.993     68.106
13          4      414      0.664     68.771
15         23      437      3.821     72.591
16          2      439      0.332     72.924
17          2      441      0.332     73.256
18          3      444      0.498     73.754
19          1      445      0.166     73.920
20         40      485      6.645     80.565
23          1      486      0.166     80.731
24          2      488      0.332     81.063
25         18      506      2.990     84.053
27          1      507      0.166     84.219
29          1      508      0.166     84.385
30         15      523      2.492     86.877
32          1      524      0.166     87.043
33          4      528      0.664     87.708
35          5      533      0.831     88.538
36          1      534      0.166     88.704
38          1      535      0.166     88.870
40          4      539      0.664     89.535
45          2      541      0.332     89.867
46          1      542      0.166     90.033
47          1      543      0.166     90.199
49          1      544      0.166     90.365
50         17      561      2.824     93.189
52          2      563      0.332     93.522
54          1      564      0.166     93.688
55          2      566      0.332     94.020
60          3      569      0.498     94.518
62          1      570      0.166     94.684
65          5      575      0.831     95.515
66          1      576      0.166     95.681
70          7      583      1.163     96.844
72          1      584      0.166     97.010
75          5      589      0.831     97.841
78          1      590      0.166     98.007
80          3      593      0.498     98.505
83          1      594      0.166     98.671
85          2      596      0.332     99.003
86          1      597      0.166     99.169
90          1      598      0.166     99.335
95          2      600      0.332     99.668
97          1      601      0.166     99.834
99          1      602      0.166    100.000
```

Observations: According to surveyed employers, 15.1% percent of the new college graduates interviewed last year (1984-85) were hired by their organizations. During 1983-84, 13.3% of those interviewed on campuses were hired. Thus employers are edging ever so slightly toward more efficient recruitment procedures.

Did your organization visit college campuses last year (1984-85) knowing that no openings were expected for interviews being conducted?

	FREOUENCY	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RESPONSE	61	.	.	.
YES	63	63	9.707	9.707

Observations: According to the surveyed organizations, 63 employers (9.7%) visited college campuses last year and interviewed graduating students when their organizations expected no openings.

Which of the following factors play a part in the decision to drop a college or university from your recruiting schedule?

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
FACTORS IN DECISION TO DROP COLLEGES													
POOR IMPRESSION OF STUDENTS	126	20	233	37	198	32	35	6	35	6	627	100	2.4
STUDENT INDIFFERENCE TO PREVIOUS VISITS	105	17	226	36	202	32	54	9	36	6	623	100	2.5
POOR COLLEGE PLACEMENT CENTER	76	12	158	25	258	41	89	14	42	7	623	100	2.8
PREVIOUS HIRING RECORD	113	18	245	40	197	32	40	6	25	4	620	100	2.4
REPUTATION OF THE SCHOOL	86	14	189	31	227	37	83	13	34	5	619	100	2.7

Observations: When dropping a college or university from their recruiting schedules, surveyed employers reported that the following factors "almost always" influenced their decisions: a poor impression of students based on previous recruiting experiences and the organization's previous record of hires from the institution. "Sometimes" influencing their decisions were the students' indifference to previous recruiting efforts, the reputation of the school, and a poor college placement center.

Should new employees entering a training program be required to sign a contract stating that they will reimburse a specified amount to the employing organization if they leave within a designated time period?

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER				
N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
47	7	46	7	124	18	99	15	359	53	675	100	4.0

Observations: Over 53% of the surveyed employers thought that new college graduates should "never" be required to sign a contract stating that they would reimburse a specified amount to the employing organization if they left within a designated time period. Another 15% said that this should "seldom" be required, while 18% suggested that a contract should "sometimes" be required. Another 7% agreed "almost always" and 7% "always" with this reimbursement policy.

Do you believe this is an ethical practice?

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER				
N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
60	9	60	9	153	23	109	16	279	42	661	100	3.7

Observations: Responses to this question were similar to the above inquiry. "Never" believing the ethics of this practice were 42% of the respondents, 16% "seldom", 23% "sometimes", 9% "almost always", and 9% "always".

Does your organization expect to implement this policy within the next year or two?

	FREQUENCY	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RESPONSE	30	.	.	.
YES	42	42	6.176	6.176
NO	638	680	93.824	100.000

Observations: Of the respondents, 42 organizations (6.2%) were expecting to implement this policy within the next year or two. The other 638 organizations (93.8%) did not anticipate this policy change.

Employers were encouraged to comment regarding the proposal that new employees entering a training program be required to sign a contract stating that they would reimburse a specified amount to the employing organization if they left within a designated time period. Remarks from surveyed employers are provided below:

> When we hire someone from 50 miles away or more, we pay to have this person's household goods moved to our area plus a travel allowance and 28 days of relocation. If the employee quits of his own accord in less than one year's time, he is required to reimburse the company for the cost of moving him here plus the 28 days relocation. After one year's time, he is under no obligation.
>
> I do not believe any organization should require new employees to sign a contract stating that they will stay employed for a specified time frame, nor should employees be required to reimburse any amount.
>
> If our recruiters do their job of prescreening, interviewing, and matching student qualifications with appropriate positions, the risk of losing an employee should be minimal. We place a tremendous amount of time on training our people for "the campus interview" and "the follow-up interview". In most cases, we are able to detect a student's sincerity for the position during the follow-up interview (home office visit). Who would want to charge an employee for a placement error? It is the responsibility of an employer to make good selections and to provide an appropriate environment and challenges for new employees.
>
> There is always a risk of losing a new employee before he/she can become a productive member of our company. If a new employee is displeased with our training program or for any reason cannot continue employment with our company, a resignation is acceptable. We would prefer a resignation to having an employee remain on a job for a "designated time period" (because he/she is under contract) and be unproductive during that time, waste our training time, and perhaps use our work time to search for other employment.
>
> Taking the question to the other extreme, as an employer we would not sign a contract which would pay a specified amount to an employee if we found reason to terminate that individual within a designated time period.
>
> If relocation expenses are provided, the individual is expected to remain with the company for one year. If not, then he is expected to repay the relocation expenses to the company.
>
> We have an employment agreement. Reimbursement of relocation expenses is requested if the employee terminates within a one year period.

After an offer of employment has been extended by an organization, how much time should be allowed for a prospective employee to accept or reject the offer?

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE												
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER		ALL		TOT-AL
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
HOW MUCH TIME SHOULD BE ALLOWED?													
AT COMPLETION OF INTERVIEW	2	0	5	1	56	9	151	23	439	67	653	100	4.6
ONE DAY	7	1	14	2	90	14	208	33	313	50	632	100	4.3
TWO TO FIVE DAYS	36	6	83	13	182	29	155	24	182	29	638	100	3.6
ONE WEEK	34	5	125	20	264	42	122	19	90	14	635	100	3.2
TWO WEEKS	73	11	188	29	207	32	109	17	73	11	650	100	2.9
AT COMPLETION OF INTERVIEWING SEASON	48	8	85	13	125	20	122	19	255	40	635	100	3.7

Observations: The most prominent answer regarding time that should be allowed for prospective employees to accept or reject an offer was two weeks (40% responding with "always" or "almost always"). The other popular answer was one week (25% responding with "always" or "almost always"). Employers responded that an applicant should "never" be required to accept or reject an offer immediately upon completion of the first interview. "Seldom" should candidates be required to accept or reject an offer within one day or two to five days. Employers objected to candidates waiting until the completion of an interviewing season to make their decisions (responding that this should "seldom" be allowed).

Some handicapper organizations are recommending that handicaps not be listed on credentials and resumes. Do you agree?

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
SHOULD HANDICAPS BE LISTED?													
EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	77	11	110	16	214	32	130	19	147	22	678	100	3.2

Observations: Responses from employers were quite mixed when deciding if handicappers should list their disabilities on credentials and resumes. The consensus answer was that handicaps be listed "sometimes". Recommending that handicaps not be listed were 11% of the employers with an answer of "always" and 16% with "almost always". Responding to the contrary were 19% with the answer of "seldom" agreeing and 22% who "never" agree that handicaps not be listed.

When handicappers are applying to your organization for employment, which of the following strategies do you recommend:

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
STRATEGIES RECOMMENDED BY EMPLOYERS													
INTERVIEW ON REGULAR SCHEDULES	277	43	248	38	96	15	8	1	21	3	650	100	1.8
APPLY DIRECTLY TO DEPARTMENT	69	11	89	14	203	31	124	19	166	25	651	100	3.4
APPLY DIRECTLY TO CEO	11	2	17	3	68	11	153	24	393	61	642	100	4.4
CONTACT PERSONNEL AND EXPLAIN	142	22	145	23	247	38	65	10	45	7	644	100	2.6
APPLY THROUGH USUAL METHODS AND NO MENTI	92	14	122	19	175	27	122	19	136	21	647	100	3.1
FIND HANDICAPPER AND USE THEM AS CONTACT	10	2	20	3	259	40	174	27	185	29	648	100	3.8

Observations: When advising handicappers on application procedures to follow when approaching their organizations, the surveyed employers "almost always" recommended interviewing on campus when their organizations are recruiting. "Sometimes" recommended were (1) applications sent directly to the department where the candidate's skills and talents will be best utilized, (2) direct contact with the personnel office with an explanation of the situation, and (3) applying through usual methods and not mentioning the handicap. "Never" recommended were the suggestions that (1) individuals find handicappers in the organization and use them as a contact person and (2) applying directly to the chief executive officer of the organization and explaining the situation in detail.

When choosing between several job offers, how important, in your opinion, are the following factors to graduating students.

	LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOTAL
	EXTREMELY HIGH		HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		NO IMPORTANCE				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
FACTORS AFFECTING STUDENT DECISIONS													
REPUTATION OF THE ORGANIZATION	257	38	342	51	63	9	5	1	1	0	668	100	1.7
ADEQUATE BENEFITS	98	15	301	45	199	30	63	10	2	0	663	100	2.4
AVAIL GRADUATE SCHOOL NEARBY	26	4	213	32	315	48	106	16	3	0	663	100	2.8
CHALLENGING WORK ASSIGNMENT	262	39	346	52	55	8	2	0	.	.	665	100	1.7
COMPETITIVE SALARY	176	27	376	57	103	16	5	1	.	.	660	100	1.9
GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF JOB	96	14	335	50	203	31	26	4	4	1	664	100	2.3
JOB SECURITY AND STEADY EMPLOYMENT	119	18	305	46	206	31	27	4	2	0	659	100	2.2
OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADVANCEMENT	267	40	326	49	65	10	6	1	.	.	664	100	1.7
GENERAL REPUTATION OF ORGANIZATION	212	32	377	58	61	9	4	1	.	.	654	100	1.8
SPECIAL DEMAND OF THE POSITION	38	6	264	40	313	48	38	6	3	0	656	100	2.5
PERSONALITIES AND ABILITIES OF SUPVRS	65	10	266	40	264	40	62	9	1	0	658	100	2.5
PERSONALITIES AND ABILITIES OF WORKERS	34	5	241	36	284	42	107	16	3	0	669	100	2.7
PERSONNEL PROBLEMS IN ORGANIZATION	29	4	145	22	291	44	177	27	19	3	661	100	3.0
TALKING WITH PEOPLE WHO HELD POSITION	50	8	222	33	240	36	131	20	20	3	663	100	2.8
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE	15	2	151	23	311	47	171	26	19	3	667	100	3.0
PHYSICAL FACILITIES OF ORGANIZATION	11	2	131	20	388	58	131	20	8	1	669	100	3.0
OTHER APPLICANTS FOR THE POSITION	8	1	65	10	221	34	274	42	89	14	657	100	3.6

Observations: In the opinion of employers, the most important factors considered by graduating students when choosing between several job offers are reputation of the organization, challenging work assignment, opportunities for advancement, general reputation of the organization, competitive salary, job security, steady employment, geographical location of the job, and adequate benefits.

Factors with "medium" importance include special demands of the position, personalities and abilities of supervisors, personalities and abilities of fellow workers, available graduate school nearby, talking with people who previously held the position, personnel problems in the organization, organizational structure, and physical facilities of the organization. Considered of "low" importance in the decision were other applicants for the position.

When new hires are attending graduate school while employed in your organization, what percentage of their

	PERCENTAGE OF TUITION PAID															TOTAL	WEIGHTED
	0%	1-2%	3-4%	5-6%	7-8%	9-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%		
.....EMPLOYER CATEGORIES	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
ACCOUNTING	16	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	2	.	.	.	.	4	23	22.2
AEROSPACE & COMPONENTS	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	16	19	92.1
AGRIBUSINESS	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	6	10	60.0
AUTOMOTIVE AND MECH EQUIPMENT	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	3	2	15	22	90.0
BANKING, FINANCE & INSURANCE	8	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	2	3	1	9	3	27	54	75.4
CHEMICALS, DRUGS, ALLIED PROD	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	7	1	25	33	95.5
COMM (RADIO, TV, & NEWSPAPR)	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0.0
CONSTRUCTION & BUILDING MATLS	3	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	.	.	2	2	14	23	80.0
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS	70	2	2	.	1	5	4	3	2	3	3	2	5	.	10	112	19.6
ELECTR MACH & EQUIP (COMPTR)	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	3	1	4	14	23	91.7
ELECTRONICS & INSTRUMENTS	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	3	35	40	96.3
FOOD, BEVERAGE PROC, & RESTR	11	2	1	.	.	.	.	1	.	2	.	.	4	1	10	32	48.4
GLASS, PKG, & ALLIED PRODUCTS	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	3	.	2	8	72.5
GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	7	1	.	.	.	.	2	3	.	2	1	.	1	2	11	30	55.1
HOSPITALS & HEALTH SERVICES	3	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	2	.	.	.	.	1	7	32.9
HOTELS, MOTELS, RESORTS & REC	4	1	.	1	.	.	.	1	.	3	.	.	.	1	2	13	36.8
MERCHANDISING & RETAIL SERVS	18	.	1	.	.	.	.	1	.	4	.	.	4	.	3	31	27.5
METALS & METAL PRODUCTS	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	1	1	1	5	1	16	28	82.1
MILITARY SERVICES	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	3	100
PETROLEUM & ALLIED PRODUCTS	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	.	2	4	3	7	20	79.0
PRINTING, PUBL & INFO SERVICES	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	.	.	1	.	2	7	54.3
PUBLIC UTILITIES INCL TRANSPO	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	3	1	1	18	9	29	63	86.7
RESEARCH & CONSULTING SERVICES	5	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	.	1	7	1	21	37	78.9
SERVICE & VOLUNTEER ORGANZATNS	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	1	.	4	11	51.8
TIRE & RUBBER PRODUCTS	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	2	100
DIVERSIFIED CONGLOMERATES	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	.	.	3	1	12	18	90.6

Continued . . .

Observations: Tuition for attending graduate school is paid in significantly varying amounts by employers responding to this survey. It was interesting to note, however, that educational institutions (19.9%) and accounting firms (19.5%) paid the least among employers responding to this question.

Paying over 90% of graduate school tuition were military services (100%); tire and rubber products (100%); electronics and instuments (96.3%); chemcials, drugs, and allied products (95.5%); aerospace and components (92.1%);electrical machinery and equipment (91.4%); diversified conglomerates (90.6%); and automotive and mechancial equipment (90.0%).

In the range of 70% to 89% of tuition for graduate school is paid by public utilities including transportation (86.7%); metals and metal products (82.2%); construction and building materials (79.1%); petroleum and allied products (79.0%); research and consulting services (78.9%); banking, finance and insurance (74.4); and glass, packaging, and allied products (71.4%).

Paying less than 70% of tuition expenses were agribusiness (60.0%); governmental administration (55.1%); printing, publishing, and informational services (54.3%); service and volunteer organizations (51.8%); food, beverage processing, and restaurants (48.3%); hotels, motels, resorts and recreational facilities (36.8%); hospitals and health services (32.9); merchandising and retail services (28.5%); educational institutions (19.9%); and accounting (19.5%).

AVERAGE OF TUITION PAID BY ALL EMPLOYERS

PERCENTAGE OF TUITION PAID															ALL EMPLOYER CATEGORIES	WEIGHTED
0%	1-2%	3-4%	5-6%	7-8%	9-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%		
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
164	6	4	1	1	6	6	13	3	36	11	14	80	34	291	670	63.8

Observation: On the average, 63.8% of graduate school tuition is paid by surveyed employers.

Did your organization have any students renege on any offers of employment last year (1984-85)?

	FREQUENCY	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RESPONSE	39	.	.	.
YES	340	340	50.671	50.671
NO	331	671	49.329	100.000

Observations: Organizations responding to this year's survey indicated that over half of them (50.7%) had graduating students renege on offers of employment last year.

How many graduating students reneged on offers of employment last year?

	FREQUENCY	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
.	299	.	.	.
0	81	81	19.708	19.708
1	104	185	25.304	45.012
2	80	265	19.465	64.477
3	39	304	9.489	73.966
4	15	319	3.650	77.616
5	32	351	7.786	85.401
6	7	358	1.703	87.105
7	2	360	0.487	87.591
8	6	366	1.460	89.051
9	2	368	0.487	89.538
10	14	382	3.406	92.944
12	2	384	0.487	93.431
14	1	385	0.243	93.674
15	6	391	1.460	95.134
16	1	392	0.243	95.377
17	1	393	0.243	95.620
19	1	394	0.243	95.864
20	2	396	0.487	96.350
25	5	401	1.217	97.567
30	3	404	0.730	98.297
35	1	405	0.243	98.540
50	1	406	0.243	98.783
52	1	407	0.243	99.027
60	1	408	0.243	99.270
79	1	409	0.243	99.513
93	1	410	0.243	99.757
99	1	411	0.243	100.000

Total Reneges: 1,766 Mean: 4.3

Observations: In 340 organizations who reported any reneges, a total of 1,766 cases were reported. From these data, it is evident that many graduating students are accepting employment with more than one organization or continuing their job searches after accepting an offer.

In your opinion, is it ethical for students to interview with other organizations after they have accepted an offer of employment?

	FREQUENCY	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO RESPONSE	25	.	.	.
YES	154	154	22.482	22.482
NO	531	685	77.518	100.000

Observations: According to 531 of the responding organizations (77.5%), it is not ethical for students to interview with other organizations after they have accepted an offer of employment. With the opposite viewpoint, 154 of the organizations (22.5%) believed it was ethical to continue to interview after accepting a job offer.

How frequent are the following problems experienced by graduating students after they have accepted an offer of employment with your organization?

	LEVELS OF FREQUENCY										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	EXTREMELY HIGH		HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		NO PROBLEM				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY STUDENTS													
RENEGING ON JOB OFFER	143	22	98	15	57	9	241	37	116	18	655	100	3.1
REQUESTS FOR RENEGOTIATION OF SALARY	89	14	98	15	79	12	206	31	185	28	657	100	3.5
LIVING ACCOMMODATIONS	12	2	96	15	227	35	227	35	89	14	651	100	3.4
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES	5	1	19	3	150	23	314	48	163	25	651	100	3.9
EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES	15	2	109	17	175	27	243	37	107	16	649	100	3.5
OTHER BENEFITS	13	2	74	11	172	27	287	44	100	15	646	100	3.6
TRANSPORTATION	12	2	63	10	160	25	293	46	114	18	642	100	3.7
LOANS	10	2	25	4	137	22	300	48	159	25	631	100	3.9
CHANGE OF STARTING DATES	16	2	56	9	159	25	309	48	103	16	643	100	3.7
SPOUSE RELOCATION	16	2	95	15	202	31	244	38	91	14	648	100	3.5

Observations: The most serious problems experienced by graduating students after they have accepted an offer of employment with an organization are (1) individuals reneging on job offers and (2) locating adequate living accommodations for new hires. Both these problems had "medium" frequencies among the surveyed organizations.

Those problems with "low" frequencies were requests for renegotiation of staring salaries, education opportunities, spouse relocation, other benefits, transportation, change of starting dates, recreational facilities, and loans.

How frequently do graduating students experience difficulty with the following factors when beginning work in your organization?

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE												
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER		TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
DIFFICULTIES EXPERIENCED BY STUDENTS													
ABSENTEEISM	.	.	3	0	85	13	514	77	63	9	665	100	4.0
WORK ETHIC	1	0	9	1	186	28	427	65	35	5	658	100	3.7
ORGANIZATION POLICIES	1	0	22	3	275	42	332	51	22	3	652	100	3.5
ROUTINE WORK	1	0	31	5	283	43	310	48	26	4	651	100	3.5
TRANSFER TO NEW LOCATION OR JOB	1	0	18	3	238	37	309	47	85	13	651	100	3.7
TRAVELLING WHEN REQUIRED BY JOB	1	0	9	1	147	23	395	61	94	15	646	100	3.9
FAMILY MATTERS NOT RELATED TO JOB	.	.	11	2	179	28	408	64	37	6	635	100	3.7
TECHNICAL EXPERTISE REQUIRED	1	0	24	4	240	37	350	54	28	4	643	100	3.6
ACCOMPLISHING ASSIGNED WORK	.	.	8	1	259	40	360	56	13	2	640	100	3.6
UNDERSTANDING THE JOB TASK	2	0	15	2	227	36	374	59	18	3	536	100	3.6
SATISFACTION WITH SALARY OFFER	4	1	28	4	199	31	364	57	48	7	643	100	3.7
VACATION REQUESTS EXCEEDING STANDARD	1	0	16	2	99	15	386	60	138	22	640	100	4.0
GETTING ALONG WITH THE BOSS	.	.	5	1	220	34	400	63	14	2	639	100	3.7
GETTING ALONG WITH OTHER EMPLOYEES	.	.	3	0	170	27	444	71	11	2	628	100	3.7
EXPECTING ADVANCEMENT PREMATURELY	5	1	66	10	342	54	181	29	38	6	632	100	3.3
UNDERSTANDING CHAIN OF COMMAND	1	0	27	4	266	42	309	49	31	5	634	100	3.5
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT OF THE JOB	1	0	7	1	147	23	422	67	54	9	631	100	3.8
INTELLIGENCE REQUIRED FOR JOB	.	.	6	1	96	15	469	74	59	9	630	100	3.9
COMMON SENSE TO PERFORM JOB	1	0	20	3	206	33	378	60	25	4	630	100	3.6
LEADERSHIP ABILITY REQUIRED ON JOB	1	0	19	3	284	44	318	50	17	3	639	100	3.5
PERSONAL VALUES VS ORGANS VALUES	2	0	11	2	230	36	368	58	28	4	639	100	3.6

Observations: The most frequent difficulty experienced by graduating students when beginning work in organizations was an expectation of premature advancement. This difficulty was only "sometimes" cited as a problem. All other difficulties were "seldom" experienced.

In your opinion, what makes a college relations and recruiting program truly outstanding? Rate these characteristics on whether or not they are important for an effective program.

	LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE												
	ALWAYS		ALMOST ALWAYS		SOMETIMES		SELDOM		NEVER		TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
WHAT MAKES A COLLEGE RELATIONS PROGRAM													
COLLEGE RELATIONS STAFF	262	41	288	45	81	13	5	1	3	0	639	100	1.7
CO-OP INTERNSHIPS AND/OR SUMMER JOBS	95	15	238	38	232	37	60	9	7	1	632	100	2.4
PRESCREENING/BIRD DOGGING	52	8	221	35	256	41	81	13	16	3	626	100	2.7
SPEAKER BUREAU	10	2	80	13	297	48	180	29	52	8	619	100	3.3
SCHOLARSHIPS	20	3	120	20	265	44	169	28	35	6	609	100	3.1
GRANTS	21	3	103	17	274	45	171	28	44	7	613	100	3.2
RESEARCH BY PERSONNEL SECTION	23	4	123	20	277	46	148	25	30	5	601	100	3.1
TRAINING PROGRAM FOR RECRUITERS	123	20	244	40	166	27	73	12	11	2	617	100	2.4
MAJOR LIAISON PERSON FOR EACH COLLEGE	120	19	284	46	149	24	57	9	10	2	620	100	2.3
SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR MINORITIES WOMEN	70	12	201	33	244	40	78	13	15	2	608	100	2.6
PROMOTION PROGRAM	53	9	189	31	265	44	77	13	18	3	602	100	2.7
COMPUTERIZED RECORD SYSTEM	61	10	198	33	226	37	98	16	26	4	609	100	2.7
MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ASSOC	61	10	167	27	247	40	117	19	21	3	613	100	2.8
COMPREHENSIVE CAMPUS VISITATIONS	125	20	265	43	183	30	35	6	6	1	614	100	2.2
STUDENT NEWSPAPER	21	3	83	14	288	47	186	31	31	5	609	100	3.2
SELECTION OF SCHOOLS	141	24	286	48	131	22	33	6	8	1	599	100	2.1
SELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES	192	32	264	44	117	19	27	4	4	1	604	100	2.0
INTERVIEW TECHNIQUES	221	36	300	49	79	13	12	2	.	.	612	100	1.8
COMMUNICATION ABILITIES	285	47	279	46	40	7	6	1	.	.	610	100	1.6
KNOWLEDGE OF ORGANIZATIONAL OPPORT	215	36	285	47	90	15	12	2	2	0	604	100	1.8
KNOWLEDGE OF COMPETITION	119	20	277	46	179	30	29	5	1	0	605	100	2.2
FAMILIARITY WITH ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	135	22	298	48	158	26	24	4	1	0	616	100	2.1
CONTACTS W/ FACULTY, DEANS, OTHERS	181	29	274	44	134	22	22	4	6	1	617	100	2.0
AVAIL OF STUDENT LISTS/RESUME BOOKS	90	15	223	36	227	37	69	11	8	1	617	100	2.5

(Continued) ...

Continued . . .

Observations: It takes certain characteristics to make a college relations and recruitment program truly outstanding, according to the surveyed employers. "Almost always" important are communication abilities; college relations staff; interview techniques; knowledge of organizational opportunities; selection of representatives contacts with faculty, deans, and others; selection of schools; familiarity with academic programs; comprehensive campus visitations; knowledge of competition; a major liaison person for each college; cooperative education; internship and summer jobs; and a training program for recruiters.

"Sometimes" important are availability of student lists and resume books, special programs for minorities and women, prescreening and bird dogging techniques, a promotion program, computerized record systems especially for large organizations, membership in professional associations (MCPA, CPC, etc.), scholarships, research by the personnel section, grants, student newspaper advertisements, and a speaker's bureau.

All the characteristics mentioned in this question were cited as "almost always" or "sometimes" important. None of the characteristics were rated as "seldom" or "never" important.

In your opinion, what are the important characteristics or practices of a good interviewer?

	LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOT-AL
	EXTREMELY HIGH		HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		NO IMPORTAN-CE				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD INTERVIEWER													
INDIVIDUAL AT ADMIN OR MGT LEVEL	93	14	288	43	203	31	70	11	9	1	663	100	2.4
SAME SEX AS INTERVIEWEE	1	0	4	1	94	14	290	43	283	42	672	100	4.3
ETHNIC ORIGIN MATCHING INTERVIEWEE	3	0	7	1	105	16	281	42	271	41	667	100	4.2
HIGHLY STRUCTURED INTERVIEW FORMAT	25	4	87	13	229	35	270	41	50	8	661	100	3.4
WELL ORGANIZED WITHOUT OBVIOUS STRUCTURE	170	25	356	53	108	16	33	5	6	1	673	100	2.0
A SINCERE ATTITUDE	391	58	258	38	26	4	.	.	.	.	675	100	1.5
CONCERNED WITH CANDIDATES CAREER PATH	240	36	358	53	68	10	4	1	.	.	670	100	1.8
REVIEWS JOBS AVAIL BEFORE INTERVIEWING	251	37	296	44	96	14	27	4	5	1	675	100	1.9
CLOSE TO THE AGE OF INTERVIEWEES	3	0	39	6	176	26	288	43	161	24	667	100	3.8
REVIEWS RESUMES AND TRANSCRIPTS BEFORE	290	43	284	42	83	12	14	2	2	0	673	100	1.7
TACTFUL AND POLITE	360	54	280	42	30	4	2	0	.	.	672	100	1.5
LISTENS TO WHAT IS SAID	497	74	169	25	5	1	1	0	.	.	672	100	1.3
APPEARS INTERESTED IN THE INDIVIDUAL	439	66	212	32	16	2	1	0	.	.	668	100	1.4
INDIVIDUAL FROM LINE POSITION	39	6	146	22	268	40	170	25	44	7	667	100	3.1
GOOD APPEARANCE	224	33	363	54	79	12	5	1	2	0	673	100	1.8
GOOD SENSE OF HUMOR	158	24	320	48	172	26	18	3	1	0	669	100	2.1
WELL ORGANIZED	299	45	323	49	43	6	.	.	.	.	665	100	1.6
PROVIDES INTERACTION W/O GEN QUESTIONS	202	30	337	50	117	17	14	2	5	1	675	100	1.9
GIVES CANDIDATES SUFFICIENT TIME	283	42	334	49	56	8	2	0	.	.	675	100	1.7

(Continued)

Continued . . .

Observations: A good campus interviewer must possess certain characteristics and perform specific practices, if they expect to achieve their organization's recruiting goals, according to employers contacted in this survey. "Extremely important" are the following: listening to what is said and appearing interested in the individual.

Factors of "high" importance according to employers are being well-organized, a sincere attitude, being tactful and polite, reviewing resumes and transcripts before interviews, giving candidates sufficient time during the interview, being concerned with the candidate's career path, having a good appearance, reviewing jobs available before interviewing, providing interaction without general questions, being well organized without obvious structure, having a good sense of humor, and being an individual at the administrative or management level.

Less important, but still deserving "medium" attention, are an individual from a line position and having a highly structured interview format.

"Low" importance was given to being close to the age of interviewees, having an ethnic origin matching the interviewees, and being of the same sex as interviewees.

What change, if any do you anticipate in numbers of cooperative education and summer internship positions in your organization this year (1985-86) contrasted with last year's opportunities?

CHANGE IN COOP/SUMMER JOBS																		
INC. 50+	INC. 25-49	INC. 11-24	INC. 9-10	INC. 7-8	INC. 5-6	INC. 3-4	INC. 1-2	SAME	DEC. 1-2	DEC. 3-4	DEC. 5-6	DEC. 7-8	DEC. 9-10	DEC. 11-24	DEC. 25-49	DEC. 50-100	TOT-AL	WEI-GHT-ED
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
24	6	5	30	2	31	26	31	477	3	4	8	2	10	4	4	11	678	2.8

Observations: Cooperative education and summer internship experiences are expected to increase by about 2.8% over those available in 1984-85 in the surveyed employer organizations during 1985-86.

In your opinion, what percent of graduating students typically accept job offers with organizations where they held cooperative education positions or summer internships?

PERCENTAGE OF GRADUATING STUDENTS																
0%	1-2%	3-4%	5-6%	7-8%	9-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	TOTAL	WEIGHTED
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
4	17	12	27	6	54	47	72	48	94	70	70	88	27	9	645	46.5

Observations: Evidently summer employment opportunities and cooperative education positions are very good recruitment programs for full-time employment, since 46.8% of the individuals in these positions typically accept job offers with the organizations where they held such assignments,according to reports from surveyed employers. Thus, if college students obtain a summer internship or cooperative education position with an organization, their chances are almost 50% of landing a full-time job offer with that organization.

What percentage of new college hires leave your organization?

	PERCENTAGE LEAVING YOUR ORGANIZATION														TOT-AL	WEI-GHT-ED
	0%	1-2%	3-4%	5-6%	7-8%	9-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	91-100%		
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	MEAN
.....TYPES OF CANDIDATES																
TECH GRADS DURING 1ST YR	210	134	45	57	7	39	15	5	1	6	.	.	.	1	520	4.1
NON TECH GRADS DURING 1ST YR	200	133	52	66	10	53	25	12	3	4	2	.	.	1	561	5.1
TECH GRADS DURING 2ND YR	133	109	72	66	21	62	32	13	2	3	.	1	1	1	516	6.2
NON TECH GRADS DURING 2ND YR	115	114	88	80	28	71	30	13	4	2	.	.	.	.	545	6.0
TECH GRADS DURING 3RD YR	85	129	68	65	17	64	48	15	5	10	1	1	1	1	510	8.1
NON TECH GRADS DURING 3RD YR	88	143	81	72	22	77	32	19	4	6	.	1	.	.	545	6.8

Observations: The longer a new college graduate stays with an organization just after graduation, the more likely they are to leave, according to the surveyed employers. It was reported that technical graduates leave at the rate of 4.2% during the first year, 6.4% during the second year, and 8.4% during the third year.

Non-technical graduates are more likely than technical graduates to leave during the first year (5.1%) and less likely during the second (6.0%) and third years (6.9%). Possibly non-technical graduates are initially placed in positions that do not closely match their career interests, so they are more likely to leave the first year. Also, job opportunities are not as plentiful for non-technical graduates (compared to job availability for technical graduates), so they are less likely to leave during the second and third years.

In your opinion, how important are each of the following for an effective placement service?

	LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOTAL
	EXTREMELY HIGH		HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		NO IMPORTANCE				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
WHAT MAKES AN EFFECTIVE PLACEMENT OFFICE													
ADVISING ON CAREER PLANNING	282	42	311	46	67	10	9	1	.	.	669	100	1.7
JOB CAMPAIGN ASSISTANCE	145	22	332	51	150	23	25	4	3	0	655	100	2.1
PRE-SCREENING SERVICES	125	19	311	48	185	28	31	5	1	0	653	100	2.2
ARRANGING CAMPUS INTERVIEWS	351	54	256	39	42	6	3	0	2	0	654	100	1.5
CREDENTIAL REFERRALS	113	17	245	38	226	35	64	10	3	0	651	100	2.4
WORKSHOPS AND COURSES IN EMPLOYMENT	116	18	261	40	214	33	54	8	6	1	651	100	2.3
VACANCY LISTINGS	154	24	318	49	153	23	26	4	4	1	655	100	2.1
CAREER INFORMATION CENTER	217	33	317	49	109	17	6	1	2	0	651	100	1.9
PLACEMENT ANNUAL	74	11	230	36	262	41	68	11	12	2	646	100	2.6
VIDEO TAPES	34	5	146	23	301	47	147	23	13	2	641	100	2.9
BOOKS	49	8	192	30	270	43	110	17	11	2	632	100	2.8
EMPLOYER LITERATURE	234	36	305	47	90	14	12	2	4	1	645	100	1.8
GRADUATE SCHOOL INFORMATION	78	12	242	38	242	38	63	10	12	2	637	100	2.5
RESEARCH	67	11	217	35	268	43	55	9	10	2	617	100	2.6
FOLLOW-UP REPORTS	49	8	231	36	281	44	67	11	7	1	635	100	2.6
RECRUITING TRENDS	93	15	276	44	209	33	51	8	4	1	633	100	2.4
SALARY REPORTS	110	17	315	50	159	25	45	7	6	1	635	100	2.2
SUPPLY/DEMAND STUDIES	98	15	296	46	187	29	51	8	8	1	640	100	2.3
STUDENT EMPLOYMENT	135	22	264	43	169	28	32	5	9	1	609	100	2.2
CO-OP AND INTERNSHIPS	167	26	283	45	141	22	37	6	6	1	634	100	2.1
SUMMER EMPLOYMENT	140	22	259	41	173	28	50	8	7	1	629	100	2.2
PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT	101	16	253	40	192	31	72	11	11	2	629	100	2.4
CAREER FAIRS	133	21	229	37	191	31	55	9	12	2	620	100	2.3
MINORITY PROGRAMS	125	20	233	38	165	27	77	12	17	3	617	100	2.4
WOMEN PROGRAMS	105	17	197	33	196	32	87	14	19	3	604	100	2.5
BUSINESS CAREER PROGRAMS	72	12	184	31	214	36	93	16	36	6	599	100	2.7
ENGINEERING CAREER PROGRAMS	85	14	207	34	192	32	79	13	38	6	601	100	2.6
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT PROGS	32	5	118	20	230	38	140	23	79	13	599	100	3.2
MILITARY OPTIONS PROGRAMS	22	4	98	16	215	36	169	28	92	15	596	100	3.4
EXPERIENCED CAND PROGRAMS	92	15	262	43	179	29	71	12	10	2	614	100	2.4

(CONTINUED)

Continued . . .

	LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE										TOTAL RESPONSE		TOTAL
	EXTREMELY HIGH		HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		NO IMPORTANCE				
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	MEAN
WHAT MAKES AN EFFECTIVE PLACEMENT OFFICE													
FRESH GRADUATES PROGRAMS	130	21	248	40	174	28	52	8	11	2	615	100	2.3
SPECIAL SERVICES	59	10	164	28	254	44	87	15	18	3	582	100	2.7
MINORITY AND WOMEN PROGRAMS	89	14	226	37	210	34	77	12	17	3	619	100	2.5
VOLUNTEER SERVICES	22	4	98	16	312	52	135	23	32	5	599	100	3.1
HIGH SCHOOL AND COLL LECTURES	43	7	140	23	282	46	116	19	29	5	610	100	2.9
MILITARY PROGRAMS	11	2	59	10	262	43	198	33	77	13	607	100	3.4

Observations: In the opinions of the surveyed employers, it is most important (rated as "high" importance) that effective placement services provide: campus interviews, advising on career planning, employer literature, career information center, job campaign assistance, vacancy listings, co-op and internships, pre-screening services, student employment, summer employment, salary reports, supply/demand studies, career fairs, fresh graduate programs, workshops and courses on employment, credential referrals, recruiting trends, part-time employment, minority programs, and experienced candidate programs.

Moderately important (rated as "medium" important) are: graduate school information, women's programs, minority programs, placement annuals, follow-up reports, business career programs, reference books, high school and college lectures, video tapes, volunteer services, government employment programs, and military options programs.

What can colleges and universities do to improve their services to employers seeking new college graduates? Comments from employers are listed below:

At all the colleges and universities I have visited, the placement offices were always cooperative and accommodating, except for one (and I believe this was a personnel problem). Overall, placement offices have shown a sincere interest in their students and their needs.

I recruit on several university campuses and I have found that my most successful recruiting is on campuses that care. As an example, one smaller college offers as much to recruiters as to students. This placement director screens students for those who would work well with me or my company. This placement director shows a genuine interest in my objectives and takes the time to learn about my needs. The placement director of this university has also visited my city and company to further enhance his knowledge of my organization. The enthusiasm he exudes when he talks about his students is a great selling point.

The other campus where I have had success is a much larger state university. Although the placement office has shown an increased interest in retailing, they cannot know their students as well as the smaller college due to the sheer numbers of students. On this campus I consult with one of the professors who has years of knowledge and experience with placing students in our business. He not only knows his students, he knows me and my company. This type of assistance is very valuable to recruiters.

Campuses that care and take a sincere interest in their students, recruiters and company goals, in my opinion, will always be successful.

A continuing effort should be exerted to bring employers on campus for company information programs, and placement workshops should be offered to students on career alternatives and interviewing.

Colleges and universities should provide more support to their placement services in areas of need identified by their placement directors. A career search and interviewing techniques course should be a two (2) credit course required for all graduating students.

Generally, we have been pleased with the services provided at placement offices. Our reasons for selecting certain institutions over others in the past have been the availability of pre-screening in specialized curricula and the numbers of available candidates. One area that could be improved, but would be difficult, is the physical facilities of some offices. More comfortable chairs for interviewers and the candidates would be helpful. A review of the lighting within interview rooms might be another area of possible improvement.

Colleges could better prepare students for the "real world" of employment. Too many students have unrealistic expectations for starting salaries, time frames for promotions, and where they "fit" in an organization. Work experiences play a key role in hiring decisions and some students are not willing to start in a position that will allow them to gain valuable experiences. They want to start at the top. Encourage students to participate in internships prior to graduation. This is a growing trend and will be strongly considered when students are ready to start their careers.

I feel that colleges could help more by being more realistic with their advice in terms of salary, benefits and types of companies. It would help if the major thrust was not entirely towards Fortune 500 companies. There are many small to mid-size corporations that can offer students a career and a challenge. These should be considered even though they do not always have the resources of major corporations. Also students should prepare themselves for the varied screening processes that exist today. Many companies are more involved in thorough screening than ever before, so students should be made aware of these (polygraph tests, drug screens, physical exams, mental ability tests, etc.).

Placement centers have a difficult job: satisfying the needs of thousands of students and hundreds of employers with limited resources. On the whole, placement centers do quite a good job in meeting those needs. Rather than suggest specific practices for placement centers to consider, I would like to reinforce the importance of a "customer" orientation. Placement centers provide a service to two primary groups of "customers": students and employers. The value of this service can only be judged by these customers. My recommendation is that placement centers establish ways to get feedback from these two customer groups. Student or employer advisory boards or surveys of users are two ways of getting such feedback. Specific suggestions will result from hearing what the customers think, and these surveys can be tailored to each school's unique situation.

Recruiting at highly organized and structured placement offices has always been enjoyable. However, one area for improvement would be to insure that all recruiters have a full schedule of students to interview. With the expense involved, especially for out-of-state recruiters, this would make the trip more cost effective. Otherwise, the services provided by your office are excellent.

The main thing that colleges and universities can do to enhance our recruiting program is to provide for co-op experiences. Over the past two years, we have developed an extensive outreach effort to get as many co-op students as possible for future hires. We intend to offer jobs to all co-ops who "work out" well with our different divisions. Those we cannot hire but are rated highly will be referred to other branches. We would also be interested in an enhanced alumni placement service, especially in the technical fields.

At present most colleges where we recruit are very well-equipped to handle both the employers' needs and students' needs. I feel it is important to continue a real harmonious atmosphere between the schools and employers.

Colleges and universities should encourage students to include references with their resumes. This would greatly simplify the reference checking process if a faculty member and prior employers evaluated the student in the following areas: initiative, ability to motivate, leadership abilities, energy level, ability to accept criticism, ability to take direction, and analytical and problem solving abilities. Telephone numbers and/or addresses should be included so that we can do additional checking if necessary.

When dealing with students, placement officers should not base their advise solely on surveys and government information. Individuals in placement should visit employers and see first-hand what is happening in the "real world".

Students should be advised to select several career goals and then devise steps to achieve them. Also, all prior, career related work experiences are the most valuable aspect of a successful job search. Placement officers and employers should do whatever is possible to help students become involved in their future career areas. These students will then have distinct advantage on the job market, because they will have a very good idea of what is involved in their furture career. After many years of exposure to a variety of employers, it has become evident that their major selection criteria is a strong work ethic/attitude. Fresh graduates should be aware of this!

College placements services keep themselves too isolated thereby becoming idealistic and sometimes unrealistic about the business sector. As a consequence, many students come to employers with the same attitude and are surprised, and sometimes disappointed, with reality.

EMPLOYERS RESPONDING TO THE 1985-86 SURVEY

-A-

A C Neilsen Co
A E Staley Manufctrg
Acme-Cleveland Corp
Addison-Wesley Pub Schl
Aerojet Electrosyste
Aetna Life & Casualt
Ail Corp Div Eaton
Airesearch Mfg
Alabama Power Co
Alexander Grant & Co
Algonac Comm Schls
Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp
Allen & O'Hara Inc
Almont Comm Schls
Alpena Pub Schls
Amdahl Corp
Amer Natl Bank Trust
Amer Natl Life Ins
Amer Natural Res Co
Amer Sym Orch League
American Appraisal
American Cyanamid Co
American Elec Power
American Family Ins
American Hosp Supply
American Motors Corp
American Re-Insurance
American Red Cross
Amerisure Insurance
Ameritrust Corp
Ames Laboratory
Amoco Production Co
Anchor Hocking Corp
Anderson Tuckey Bernhardt & Co
Anheuser-Busch Co
Ann Arbor Pub Schls
Appleton Area Schl Dist
Applied Physic Lab
Applied Technology
Argonne National Laboratory
Arkansas Power & Light
Armstrong Machines
Armstrong World Ind
Arthur Andersen & Co
Arthur Young & Co
ASG Industries Inc
Ashland Oil Inc
Atlanta Research Co
Aurora Public Schls
Austin Co The
Austin Paper Co
Avery International

-B-

B'Nai B'Rith Organization
Babcock & Wilcox
Badger Engineers Inc
Badische Corp
Balt Dept Pub Works
Baltimore Gas & Electric
Bangor Pub Schls
Bank of Commonwealth
Bank of Lansing
Bank of the West
Bank One-Dayton National
Bankers Life Co
Battle Creek Schls
BDM Corp The
Berkeley City Schl Dist
Belden Cooper Industries
Belk Stores Service
Bell Helicopter Text
Bell of Pennsylvania
Bendix Allied Auto
Bendix ECD
Beneficial Mgmt Corp
Benefits Admin
Benton Harbor Schls
Bessemer & Lake Erie Prod
Betz Labs Inc
Big Rapids Pub Schls
Birmingham Schl Dist
Bishop Buffets Inc
Bloomfield Hls Schls
Bloom Engineering Co
Bloomfield Hills Schools
Bloomingdales
Blue Shield of California
Boehringer Ingelheim
Boise Cascade Corp
Booker Assoc Inc
Borg-Warner Air Cond
Bortz Enterprises
Boy Scouts of Amer
BRC
Bristol Leisenring
Brookline Pub Schls
Brooklyn Union Gas
Brown Co
Bridgeport-Spaulding
Brown Derby Inc
Brown & Root Inc
Brown & Sharpe
Bullitt County Schl Dist
Bunker Ramo Corp

Burgess & Niple LTD
Buena Vista Schls
Burroughs Corp

-C-

Cable News Network
C P Rail
Caltex Petroleum Co
CBS Technology Cntr
Cahill-Stone Inc
CAI
Calcasieu Parish SB
Camp Fowler Inc
Capital Analysts
Carnation Co
Carstab
Caterpillar Tractor Co
Catholic Soc Servs
CECO Corp
Centel Corp
Central Illinois Public Ser
Central Maine Power
Central Michigan Univ
Central National Bank
Central National Bank-Cleveland
Central Services
Central Soya Co Inc
Central & SW Service
Central Tele Util Co
Cessna Aircraft
Champion Internatl
Charleston County Schl Dist
Checkers Simon & Rosner
Chem-Trend Inc
Chemical Abstracts
Chemical Bank
Cherry Central Corp
Chesapeake Poto Tele
Chevron Companies
Chicago & NW Trans
Chittenden School District
Christina School District
Chrysler Corp
Ciba-Geigy Corp
Cigna Corporation
Cinci Milicron Heald
Cintas Corp
Civilian Personnel Office
Clarence Davids & Sons
Clark County School District
Clovis School District
Coldwater Community Schools
Coll Life Insur Co
Collins & Aikman Corp
Collins Foods Intl
Colt Indust-Steel Div
Columbia Gas Dist
Columbia Gas System
Commodore Semiconductor
Commonwealth Edison
Community Unit Schl Dist
Comptrol of Currency
Compuserve Inc
Computer Science Co
Comsat Laboratories
Congoleum Corp
Consolidated Edison
Consumers Power Co
Container Sales Corp
Continental Grain Co
Continental Insurance Co
Control Data Corp
Cook Family Foods
Coopers & Lybrand
Cordis Corp
Corduroy Rubber Co
Corning Glass Works
Cozad City Schools
Craig Systems
Croswell Lex Com Schl
Crowe Chizek & Co
CRS Sirrine Inc
CTS of Elkhart Inc
Cullinet Software
Cummins Engine Co

-D-

Dade County School Systems
Dallas Ind School District
Dallas Police Department
Davison Community Schls
Dayco Corp
Dearborn Public Schools
Def Contract Audit
Defense Comm Agency
Dekalb-Pfizer Gentcs
Denver Public Schools
Detroit City Per Dept
Detroit Edison Co
Detroit Police Dept
Devilbiss Company
Devlieg Machine Co
Douglas School District 51-1
Dow Chemical USA
Dow Corning Corp
Drackett Company
Dravo Engineers Corp
Duke Power Company
Dupuis & Ryden P C
Duplex Products Inc

-E-

E I Dupont De Nemour
Eau Claire Schl District
Easter Seals Soc Cr
E G & G Idaho Inc
E & J Gallo Winery
Eli Lilly & Co
Ellis Naeyaert Genheimer Assoc
Engelhard Corp
Ensearch Explor Inc
Environmental Research Inst
Ernst & Whinney
Escambia Schl Board
Ethyl Corp
Evansville-Vanderbur
Excel Corporation

-F-

Fairchild Industries
Family & Child Serv
Famous-Barr Co
Farm Credit Services
Fed Reserve Bank New York
Federal Highway Administration
Federal Mogul Corp
Federal Reserve System
First City Natl Bank Houston
First Hawaiian Bank
First Natl Bank-Atlanta
First Natl Bank-Oregon
First of America Bank
First Wisconsin Natl Bank
Fisher Controls Intl
Floating Point System
Fluor Power Services
Flexible Corp The
FMC Corp
Foleys Department Stores
Foote Cone & Belding
Ford Aerospace & Com
Ford Elec & Refrigeration Corp
Ford Motor Car Truck
Ford Motor Company
Foremost Insurance Co
Formation Inc
Fort Bend ISD
Foster Forbes Glass Division
Frederick & Nelson
Freightliner Corp
Fremont Public Schools

-G-

G A Technologies Inc
Gearhart Industries
GE-Lighting Bus Group
General Mills Inc
General Motors Corp
General Motors-Packard
General Pub Util Serv Co
General Reinsurance Corp
General Telephone Co Florida
General Telephone Co Illinois
General Electric Comany
George A Hormel & Co
Georgetown City Schl Dist
Gilbert Commonwealth
Gilbert Robinson Inc
Gimbels Midwest
Gimbels Pittsburgh
Glenridge Properties
Gold Kist Inc
Goldsmiths Dept Store
Golva School District
Good Earth General Mills
Goodyear Aerospace
Goodyear Tire & Rubber
Goulds Pumps Inc
Grand Ledge Pub Schls
Granite Construction Co
Great-West Life Assr
GTE Data Services Inc
Guardian Industries

-H-

HBE Corporation
HRB Singer Inc
Hahnemann University
Halliburton Services
Hallmark Cards Inc
Hancock/Dikewood Inc
Harford County Public Schools
Harris Corp Elec Div
Harris Corp RF Comm
Haworth Inc
Havi Corp
Heath Consultants
Hendrix & Dail Inc
Herman & Maclean PC
Hewitt Associates
Hewlett Packard
Hewlett-Packard Co
Higbee Company The
Highland Park City of
Hilshire Farm Co

Hilton Hotels Corp
Home Insurance Co
Honeywell Inc
Hoover Company
Horton Nursery
Host Enterprise Inc
Howmet Turbine Corp
Hughes Aircraft
Hyatt Hotel Corp
Hygrade Food Production

-I-

IBM Corp
ICI Americas Inc
Illinois Bell
Illinois Department of Transportation
Illinois Environmental Prot
Illinois Farm Bureau
Illinois Power Company
Imed Corporation
Indiana Farm Bureau
Inco US
Indian River School District
Industrial National Bank
Indiana St Personnel Dept
Indiana Dept Natural Resources
Ingersoll-Rand Co
Information Intl
Inland Container
Inst for Paralegal Training
Insurance Service Office
Interlake Inc
Intl Minerals & Chem Corp
International Paper
International Harvester
Internal Revenue Service
Internorth Inc
Intl Res & Dev Corp
Irish Hills GSC
ITT Aerospace OPT DV

-J-

J A Jones Construct
J Walter Thompson Co
Jackson County Extension Off
Jackson Public Schools
Jacobson Stores Inc
Jenison Public Schools
Johnson & Johnson
F Joseph Lamb Co

-K-

Kansas Dept of Transportation
Kansas Div of Pers Services
Kaufman & Broad
Kaufmann's Dept Store
Kellogg Company
Kelly Services Inc
Kelsey Hayes Co
Kentucky Power Co
Kent County Public Scools
Kern High School District
Key State Bank
Koch Industries
Koch Refining
Kohl's Dept Stores
Kurt Salmon Assoc

-L-

LNR Communications, Inc
L S Ayres & Co
Labelle Management
Lakewood Public Schools
Lansing School District
Lear Siegler Home DI
Lettuce Ent You
Levy Organization The
Liberty Mut Insur Co
Lincoln Laboratory
Lincoln Telephone Co
Long Beach Unified Schl Dist
Loral Electronic Systems
Los Angelas Cnty Dept Pub Wks
Los Angeles UFSD
Lutron Electronics
Lyle D Hepfer & Co, P.C.

-M-

Maccabees Mutual Life
Mackinac Hotel & Con
Madison Metro Schl Dist
Madison School Dist 321
Mallory Components Group
Management Information
Manufac Natl Bank Detroit
Manufac Data Systems Inc
Manufac Hanover Trust
Marathon Oil Co
March of Dimes
Markem Corp
Marriott Hotels
Marshall Fields

Mason & Hanger Silas Mason Co
Mason City Comm School Dist
Masonite Corp
Mayo Clinic
McAllen Indep School
McClelland Engineers In
McDonnell Douglas
McGladrey Hendrickson Pullen
Mclouth Steel Corp
Mead Corp
Mead Johnson & Co
Meijer Inc
Mellon Bank East
Memorex
Merck & Co Inc
Metcalf & Eddy Inc
Metro Edison Co
Michigan Bell Telephone Co
Michigan Capital Girl Scout Council
Michigan City Area Schools
Michigan Civil Service
Michigan Dept of Trans
Michigan Office of Audit
Michigan State Police
Midland Public Schools
Milford Public Schools
Millard Public Schools
Millhouse & Holaly
Milliken & Co
Milwaukee City of
Milwaukee Public Schools
Milwaukee Dept Pers
Minnesota Mutual Life
Minnesota Power
Missouri Highway & Trans
Mobile County Public Schls
Mobile Oil Corp
Monroe City of
Monroe Personnel Dept
Monsanto Company
Moore Products Co
Morrison Knudsen Engineers Inc
Morton Salt Co
Morton Thiokol Wasatch Operations
Motor Wheel Corp
Motorola Inc
Mountain Bell Telephone
Mt Fuel Supply Co
Muskegon Public Schools
Mutual of Omaha

-N-

Nabisco Brands Inc
Nalco Chemical Co
NARF Placement Office
Nash Finch Company
National Bank of Detroit
National Blvd Bank of Chicago
National Gypsum Company
National Lead Co of Ohio
National Steel Corp
Navy Department of
Navy Resale & Serv Support Off
NCR Corp US Data Pro
Neches Butane Prods
Needham Harper Advertising
Nevada Power Company
Newaygo Public Schools
Newmont Services Ltd
Niagara Machine Tool
Niagara Mohawk Power Co
Nielsen Restaurant
Norfolk City Schools
Norfolk Southern Co
Norfolk Southern Corp
Northern Illinois Gas
Northern Telecom Inc
Northrop Corp
Northwest Public Schools
Northwestern Bell
Northwestern Mutual
Norton Company
Noxell Corporation

-O-

Oak Park River Forest High School
Oakland Unif School Dist
Oakland University
Ohio Edison Company
Ohio Power Company
Old Kent Bank Trust
Olin Corporation
Olofsson Corp
Omaha Public Power Dist
Omaha Public Schools
Omark Industries
O Niels
Optical Coating Lab
Orange & Rockland Utilities
Ore Ida Foods Inc
Ortho Pharmaceutical
Oshkosh Area School Dist
Oster
Ostego Public Schools
Owens Corning Fiberglass
Owens Corning
Owens Illinois Inc
Owosso Public Schools

-P-

Pacesetter Bank & Trust
Pacific Northwest Bell
Pacific Western Bank
Paradyne Corp
Parker Chemical Company
Parker Pen Co
Parker Unified School Dist #27
Peat Marwick Mitchell & Lo
Penelec Company
Penn Mutual Life Ins Company
Pennsylvania Dept of Trans
Pennsylvania Power Light Co
Pennsylvania State University
Peoples Gas Light Co
Personnel Services
Petosky Public Schools
Petrie Stores Corp
Pfizer Inc
Philips Ind Inc
Phoenix Mutual Life
Planning Research Co
Plante & Moran
Plaquemines Parish
Polack Corp
Polaroid Corp
Polytech Foundation
Ponderosa Inc
Pontiac City School Dist
Port Authority Trans
PPG Industries Inc
Pratt & Whitney Airc
Precision Monolithics Inc
Prestolite Motor Div
Price Waterhouse
Prince George City Public Schools
Procter & Gamble
Professional Ser Ind
Public Service Colorado
Public Service Electric Gas
Public Service Indiana
Public Service Oklahoma
Pullen AM & Co
Pulte Home Corp

-Q-

Quaker Oats
Quincy Stamping & MA

-R-

Racal-Miglo Inc
Radisson Hotel
Ranco Inc
Rapid City Area Schools
Rauland
Raymond Intl Builders
Raytheon Co
Raytheon ESD NJO
RCA
Ren Plastics
Republic Bank Corp
Rexham Corp
Reynolds Metal Co
River Valley School
Robert Morris College
Rochester City School District
Rochester Community Schools
Rocket Research Co
Rockwell Intl
Rodeway Inns Intl
Rohm & Haas Company
Rolscreen Co
Ruby Tuesday Inc
Russell Bus Forms
Rust-Oleum
Ryland Homes

-S-

Saginaw Public Schools
Saint Marys Hospital
San Diego Gas & Electric
Sandia National Labs
Sangamo Weston Inc
Santa Fe School District
Saudi American Bank
Scallop Corporation
Schippers Kintner Ro
Schlumberger Well Se
Schneider Transport
School District Number 67
Schulze & Burch Co
Sci Systems
Scientific Atlanta
Scranton School District
SDG & E
Seaboard Systems Railroad
Second National Bank
Seidman & Seidman
Seismograph Serv Corp
S G Carlton & Company
Shaker Heights City Schools
Shopko Stores Inc
Siemens-Allis
Sikorsky Aircraft
Siliconix
Sky Chefs
Smithkline Beckman
Snap-On-Tools

Sohigro Service Co
Sonat Inc
South Redford School District
South Texas ISD
Southeastern Michigan Gas
Southern New Eng Telephone
Southwest Research Institute
Southwire Company
Sperry Corporation
Sperry Informatin Systems Group
Sperry New Holland
Spring Branch ISD
Spring Independent Schools
Springfield Public Schools
SPS Technologies
St Johns Hospital
St Louis County Water
Standard Federal Bank
Standard Oil Company
Standard Oil Company Ohio
Stanley Consultants
Star Market Company
State Farm Insurance Co
State Mutual of America
Steelcase Inc
Steketees
Sterling Winthrop
Stewart Dry Goods Co
Stewart Warner Corp
Stouffer Foods
Stroh Brewery
Strouss
Sun Banks Inc
Sun Exploration & Production
Sundstrand Advanced Tech Group
Sybra Inc
Szabo Food Service

-T-

Taco Bell
Tacoma Public Schools
Televideo Systems
Telex Computer Products
Tennessee Valley Aut
Texas American Bank
Texas Eastern Co
Texas Oil & Gas Corp
Texas Utilities Service
Thalhimer Bros Inc
Thomas & Betts Corp
Timken Co
Toledo Edison
Topeka Shawnee D-501
Torrington Co
Touche Ross & Co
Town & Country Fashions
Transition Team
Travenol Labs Inc
Troy School District
Tullahoma City Schools
Tulsa Public Schools
Tyler Refrigeration Corp

-U-

UOP Inc
US Army Aberdeen Proving Ground
US Dept of Commerce
US Dept of Energy
US Dept of Health Education
US Dept of Hud
US FBI
US General Acct Office
US Nasa Lewis Res CE
US Naval Weapons Sta
US Navy Dept of
US Social Security
UNC Nuclear IND
Union Electric Co
Union Mutual Life Insurance
Union Texas Petro Corp
United Energy Resources
United Methodist HSE
United Space Boosters
United Technologies
United Tech Corp
University of Arizona
University Park
Univac Data Proc Div
Universal Forest Pr
Upshur County School Dist

-V-

Valley Natl Bank
Valmont Industries
Vermeer Manuf Co
Vestal Laboratories
Veterans Admin Ct of
Vickers Incorporated
Virginia Dept Trans
Virginia Elec Power
Volkswagen of America

-W-

Wachovia Bank & Trust Co
Warren Consolidated Schools

Washington Personnel
Washoe County School District
Waterford Schools
Waukesha School District
Waukesha Engine Division
Wausau Insurance COS
Weber County School District
Westinghouse Electric Corp
Westinghouse Furniture Systems
Weyerhaeuser Company
Wickes Lumber Company
Wilcox Electric Inc
Winkelman Stores Inc
Wisconsin Bell
Wisconsin Electric Power
Wisconsin State of
Wisconsin Telephone Co
Wolverine Technologies
Wyandotte Public Schools
Wyatt Cafeterias
Wyman-Gordon Co

-Y-

Yoplait USA

-Z-

Zelenka Evergreen Nursery